The Indian Historical Quarterly

Vol. XX **June, 1944** **No. 2**

Kingship and Kingly Administration in the Atharvaveda

Between the charms, spells and incantations of the *AV. Saṃhitā** and the hymns and prayers of the *ṚV. Saṃhitā* there is all the difference between a popular and a hieratic religion. But in respect of political institutions we can trace, on the whole, a close affinity between these two great compilations of sacred texts. Of such affinity kingship and kingly administration offer conspicuous examples.

Attributes of kingship

The *AV.* knows monarchy as the normal type of constitution. Among famous kings singled out for praise in this work are Kaurama, king of the Ruśamas (XX. 127. 1) and Parikṣit, king of the Kurus (XX. 127. 7-10). The king's position, as in the *Ṛgveda,* is one of the highest dignity. In the fashion of the *ṚV.*, the *AV.* applies the honorific epithet *rājan* to the gods Varuṇa, Soma, Yama and Agni.[1] Significant of the dignified position of the *AV.* king is the fact that in III. 3. 1 and 5 in course of a prayer intended for restoration of an exiled king, Agni is invoked to lead with respect[2] "yon man of bestowed oblation," while Indra and Agni and all the gods are declared to have maintained for him security (*kṣema*) in the people (*viś*).

In other passages stress is laid upon the king's authority over his subjects. In its mildest form this principle is found in IV. 8. 4 conveying, as

* In the present paper the translations of *AV.* texts are borrowed, unless otherwise stated, from the work *Atharva-veda Saṃhitā. Translated with a critical and exegetical commentary,* by Whitney, revised by Lanman, Harvard Oriental Series, vols. VII-VIII.

1 For references see Griffith's tr., Indexes to volumes I & II *s.v.* king; see also *A Complete Alphabetical Index of all the words in the Atharvaveda,* prepared and published by Swami Visheshwaranand and Swami Nityanand, *s.v.* Rājā.

2 *Namas* in the original, tr. as 'homage' by Whitney and Lanman, but here rendered in the more general sense of 'respect'.

in *ṚV*. X. 173, the poet's prayer that all the people (*viśas*) may desire the king.[3] Of the same character is *AV*. VII. 94 (=*ṚV*. X. 173. 6) invoking Indra to make the people (*viś*) "like-minded, wholly ours."[4] A stronger note is sounded in XIX. 41 where the gods are invoked to make royalty, strength and force submissive to the king.[5] More significant is III. 4 used in the ritual texts for the establishment of a king. It contains (*Ibid*., 1) the poet's exhortation to the king to bear rule as 'the lord of the people, sole king' (*viśāṃ patir ekarāṭ*), to become 'one for waiting on, for respect' (*upasadyo namasyaḥ*) and so forth. With this may be mentioned IV. 22 used, according to the ritual authorities, for victory in battle as well as for consecration of a king. In it the poet prays (*Ibid*., 1-5) to Indra to 'make this man sole chief of the people (*imaṃ viśāmekavṛṣaṃ kṛṇu*), to 'unman all his enemies' (*niramitrān akṣṇuhi*), to 'make them subject to him in the contests for pre-eminence' (*śatruṃ randhaya sarvamasmai*), to make him 'the summit of authorities' (*varṣma kṣatrāṇām*), to make him 'riches-lord of riches' and 'people-lord of people' (*dhanapatir dhanānāṃ viśāṃ viśpatiḥ*), to make him 'the sole chief of the people' and 'uppermost of kings descended from Manu' (*ekavṛṣam janānām uta rājñām uttamaṃ mānavānām*). In the above, it will be noticed that the king's attributes are said to comprise the highest dignity as well as unchallenged and supreme authority. *Rāṣṭra* ('royalty') and the destruction of rivals are the blessings for which a chief prays to an amulet (*maṇi*) in I. 29. 4. The climax is reached in VI. 86 glorifying a person desirous of supremacy with the epithets 'chief of Indra, chief of Heaven, chief of earth' as well as 'chief of all existence,' 'the summit of mankind,' and 'part-sharer of the gods.'[6] That the king's sway was sometimes felt to be oppressive is proved by VI. 40. 2 where in the midst of a prayer for peace and security the wish is expressed that the wrath of kings may be turned to other places (*anyatra rājñāmabhiyātu manyuḥ*).[7]

3 *viśastvā sarvā vāñchantu.*

4 *yathā na indraḥ kevalīr viśaḥ saṃmanaskarat.*

5 *tato rāṣṭraṃ balamojaś ca jātaṃ tadasmai devā upasaṃnamantu.*

6 The relevant passages in the original are as follows:—

vṛṣendrasya vṛṣā divo vṛṣā pṛthivyā ayam/
vṛṣā viśvasya bhūtasya tvam ekavṛṣo bhava/
samrāḍ asya surāṇāṃ kakun manuṣyāṇām/
devānām ardhabhāg asi tvam ekavṛṣo bhava/

For *indrasya* in the above, Whitney and Lanman suggest *aindrasya* or *idhrasya.*

7 The same qualities are ascribed metaphorically (VI. 98) to the god Indra in

Not only is kingship in the *AV.* vested with high dignity and authority, but there is a tendency to strengthen it with the tie of divine sanctity. In the delightful story of Parikṣit who is described in XX. 127 as a model king, he is acclaimed not only as 'sovran whom all people love, the king who ruleth over all', but also as 'exceeding mortals like a god.'[8] Other passages would seem to identify kingship with divinity. In the passage above cited (VI. 86. 3) a chief desirous of supremacy is greeted, as we have seen, with the epithet 'part-sharer of the gods.' This is reminiscent of the title *ardhadeva* applied to king Trasadasyu in the Ṛgvedic text (IV. 42. 9). Again in IV. 8. 3 in course of a hymn used for the consecration of a king, a whole Ṛgvedic verse III. 38. 4 addressed to the god Indra is boldly transferred to the earthly king. This transference probably suggests a conscious attempt to invest the earthly king with the attributes of divine Indra.[9] Connection with Indra is directly expressed in IV. 22. 7 where the king performing the consecration ceremony is called 'one having Indra as his companion' (*Indrasakhā*). Nevertheless we have the fundamental fact that the *AV.* does not claim for the king, any more than the *ṚV.*, a divine descent. In IV. 22. 5 quoted above, the poet is content to pray to Indra to make this king "the uppermost of kings descended from Manu" who is simply 'the first man', 'the father of the human race', according to the ideas of the Vedic Indians.

his aspect of ruler of divine subjects (*daivīrviśaḥ*). Here he is acclaimed not only as 'over-king among kings' (*adhirājo rājasu*), but also as 'one to be famed, to be praised, to be greeted, to be waited on, and to be reverenced' (*carkṛtya iḍyo vandyaścopasadyo namasyaḥ*). Mention may be made of the long hymn XIII. 1 addressed to Rohita ("The Ruddy One", a form of the sun), which Bloomfield (quoted by Whitney and Lanman, p. 709) regarded as "an allegorical exaltation of a king and his queen." Here the poet prays (*Ibid.*, 2 and 10) that the Deity may mount the people that are sprung from him (*viśa ā roha tvadyonayo yāḥ*) and that the people may enter into the Deity with propitious mind (*tāstvā viśantu manasā śivena*).

8 *rājño viśvajanīnasya yo devomartyā̐ ati/*
vaiśvānarasya suṣṭutimā sunotā Parikṣitaḥ/ XX. 127. 7. The above follows Griffith's tr.

9 The verse in Whitney and Lanman's translation is as follows:—
'Him approaching all waited upon (*pari-bhūṣ*); clothing himself in fortune he goes about (*car*), having own brightness; great is that name of the virile (*vṛṣan*) Asura; having all forms, he approacheth immortal things.' Commenting on the above, Lanman suggests that the phrase *asurasya nāma* in the original is a periphrasis of *asuryam*, 'the divinity that doth hedge a king.'

bow to be taken away from his hand along with his *kṣatra, varcas,* and *bala* ('strength').

The above passages throw some light upon the attributes of kingship in these times. Kingship at this period involved, it would seem, not only the possession of brilliance, fame and wealth, but also the control over the kingdom (*rāṣṭra*). This last anticipated the phenomenon of territorial monarchy which was to be fully evolved out of the primitive tribal kingship in the following period. In the next place, kingship according to the above passages involved authority over the subjects (*viś*), a point to be repeatedly inculcated in the later *Saṃhitās* and the *Brāhmaṇas*. Another attribute of the king predicated in the above is *Brahma* usually translated as spiritual power. In the present context this term could only have been used in a metaphorical sense, since the complete separation of the temporal and spiritual powers seems to be characteristic of the Vedic State from early times.

Relations between brahma and kṣatra

Reference has just been made to the characteristic Vedic view of the separation of the temporal and spiritual powers. It is in the *Av.* that the two terms indicative of these powers, viz. *brahma* and *kṣatra,* both of which are found in the *Ṛgveda,* are first brought into mutual relation. The high significance as well as essential difference of these powers is hinted at in XV. 10. 3-4 where *brahman* ('sacrament)' and *kṣatra,* deriving their origin from the mystical *vrātya,* are said to enter Bṛhaspati and Indra respectively. The conception of *brahma* and *kṣatra* as the two dominant powers is reflected in II. 15. 4 where in a charm against fever *brahma* and *kṣatra* are mentioned in a number of diads that do not fear and are not harmed.[12] Another passage (X. 5. 1-5) joining the sacrificial water successively with *Brahman* and *Kṣatra,* as well as Indra, and Soma in a charm for victory, illustrates the quasi-sancitity of these powers.

Summary

In summing up the above facts it would appear that kingship in the *AV.*, inspite of a strong tendency to invest it with divine sanctity, remained essentially, as in the *Ṛgveda,* a magistracy charged with exercise of the highest administrative and military functions. The concepts of cosmic order (*ṛta*), divine ordinances (*vrata* or *dhāman*) and ancient custom

12 *yathā brahma ca kṣatraṃ ca na bibhīto na riṣyataḥ.*

(*prathamāni dharmāṇi* and *dharmaṃ purāṇam*)[13] met with in the *AV.*, continued to operate as moral restraints on the king's powers. To judge by the significant term *rājakṛt* applied to the *rājans* (III. 5. 7), it would appear that certain elements may have come to act as constitutional checks on the king's authority. The instability of the king's position referred to in *ṚV.* X. 174 and the like is reflected in a larger measure by a series of *AV.* hymns intended for the restoration of an exiled king.

The king's administration

As compared with the administration of the Ṛgvedic times, that of the *AV.* seems to have attained a certain degree of definiteness. The repeated references in the *AV.*[14] to the ever watchful spies of the gods suggest, as in the case of the *ṚV.*, the king's control over criminal jurisdiction by means of appropriate agents. Regarding crimes against property, we hear of thieves bound in stocks, but whether this was done by the king's authority or by the robbed is uncertain.[15] We have, however, positive evidence that the *sabhā* (or a committee of the same) acted as a court of justice in the times of the *AV.* and later *Saṃhitās*.

As regards finance, *AV.* repeatedly refers to the term *bali* signifying 'contributions from subjects' even in the Ṛgvedic times. In some passages (X. 7. 39; X. 8. 15; XIX. 55. 6; XI. 1. 6; XI. 6. 18-19 etc.) it is used in the metaphorical sense of 'tribute' or 'offering' paid by human or divine beings to the gods. But in other passages it definitely stands for contributions paid by the people to the king. Thus in III. 4. 3 in the midst of blessings invoked for the newly consecrated king, we are told that he shall see arrive much tribute. This passage would seem to imply that *bali* had already become a compulsory payment instead of a voluntary one. Another hymn (III. 29) which is concerned with the offering of a white-footed sheep

13 For *dhāman* cf. II. 1. 3; for *dharma* VI. 51. 3; for *dharmāṇi prathamāni*, VII. 5. 1: for *vrata*, XVIII, 1. 5: for *dharmaṃ purāṇam*, XVIII. 3. 1.

14 Cf. IV. 16. 4 where in a prayer to Varuṇa we read how the god's 'thousand-eyed' spies, proceeding from the sky, look over the earth beneath them (*diva spaśaḥ pra carantīdamasya sahasrākṣā ati paśyanti bhūmim*); V. 6. 3 where Soma's rays are described as spies never-closing their eyes and present everywhere with fetters for tying (*taṣya spaśo na nimiṣanti bhūrṇayaḥ pade pade pāśinaḥ santi setave*). Also cf. XVIII. 1. 9 stating how the spies of the gods about here never stand still and never close their eye-lids (*na tiṣṭhanti na nimiṣantyete devānāṃ spaśa iha ye caranti*).

15 See *VI s.v. tāyin* for references.

at certain sacrifices begins thus:—"What the kings share among themselves —the sixteenth of what is offered and bestowed—yon assessors (*sabhāsad*) of Yama; from that the white-footed sheep, given (as) ancestral offering, releases.' Further on we read:—'He who gives a white-footed sheep commensurate with (his) world, he ascends unto the firmament, where a tax is not paid by a weak man for a stronger.' The purport of the whole passage is that the sacrificer by offering the sheep is released from payment that would be othewise due to Yama's councillors on his admission into the other world. In the above the term translated as 'tax' is in the original *śulka*, a new revenue item introduced here for the first time. Again, the striking picture of Heaven as a place where *śulka* is not paid by a weak man for a stronger[16] proves conclusively the compulsory character of the payment in question. In so far as the specific rate of 1/16 is concerned, it already proves the tax as consisting of a certain proportion of the property of the subjects. Another passage (IV. 22. 2) introduces us for the first time to definite heads of revenue anticipating those of the later Arthaśāstra and Smṛtis. Here the poet prays to Indra to portion the newly consecrated king in village, in horses, in kine.[17] In these items we have forerunners of the kings' grain-share and dues from village cattle included among the king's regular receipts in later times. Of the agency employed by the king for the collection of these revenues, our texts unfortunately fail to give us any definite indication.[18]

Like the *ṚV.*, the *AV.* has a number of divine epithets which were afterwards transferred to the earthly king to indicate his guardianship of the sacred law. Amongst such epithets are *dhṛtavrata* ('he whose laws stand first') and *dharmakṛt* ('he who keeps the law') applied to Indra in XX. 54. 2 and XX. 62. 6 respectively. Another passage (I. 25. 1) refers to the *dharmadhṛta* ('maintainers of duty') gods, meaning 'the gods who observe everlasting statutes of natural and, moral order' (Griffith).

Not much light is thrown upon the branch of military administration in the Atharvavedic times. We have, however, a hint that the king was regarded as head of the army. In IV. 8. 2 he is acclaimed as slayer of his rivals (*sapatnahā*). Elsewhere (IV. 22. 7) at the end of a hymn for the success and prosperity of a king we are told: 'Of tiger-aspect, do thou beat

16 *sa nākamabhyārohati yatra śulko na kriyate abalena balīyase.*

17 *emaṃ bhaja grāme aśveṣu goṣu.*

18 On the above cf. *Hindu Revenue System*, pp. 5-7.

down the foes; sole chief, having Indra as companion, having conquered, seize thou on the enjoyments of them that play the foe.'[19]

The Ṛgvedic *grāmaṇī* reappears in the *AV*. If, as seems likely, he is now to be identified with the village headman, it would follow that the village was the unit of administration.[20] An *AV*. passage (XIX. 31. 12-13), identifying a magical amulet in turn with *grāmaṇī*, vigour, riches and plenty, suggests that the *grāmaṇī's* office was not only (as in the *Ṛgveda*) one of high prosperity, but also of authority. Of greater importance is III. 5. 7 specifying *grāmaṇīs* and *sūtas* along with *rājānaḥ rājakṛtaḥ* in a list of persons of the royal *entourage* whom a newly consecrated king desires to have as his subjects. As we understand this passage, it means that the *sūtas* and the *grāmaṇīs* ranked as non-royal king-makers by the side of the nobles who were royal king-makers.[21] This important passage proves, in the first place, the inferior status of the *sūtas* and the *grāmaṇīs* as compared with the *rājans* (princes or nobles). On the other hand it would seem to show that the *sūtas* and *grāmaṇīs* already enjoyed sufficient constitutional authority to be ranked in the list of persons in the closest contact with the king. Probably they had acquired even thus early the designation of 'king-makers' which was to be definitely applied to them in a *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* passage XIII. 2. 18. Of the precise authority exercised by them, our texts unfortunately do not give any indication.

In the above the *sūtas* (now mentioned for the first time) are associated with the *grāmaṇīs*, as they were destined to be in the later *Saṃhitās* and the *Brāhmaṇas*. If the title *sūta* is correctly rendered as 'court-minstrel' or 'herald', it would prove how a mere officer of the royal court and household exercising formal functions had been exalted to high rank.[22]

19 *vyāghrapratīkova bādhasva śatrūn*. The *AV*. hymns containing prayers for success in battle may be regarded in a general way as pointing to the military function of the king.

20 It is worth remarking that Whitney and Lanman, (III. 5. 7 etc.) translate *grāmaṇī* as troop-leader.

21 The passage in the original is as follows:

ye rājāno rājakṛtaḥ sūtā grāmaṇyaśca ye/
upastīn parṇa mahyaṃ tvaṃ sarvān kṛṇvabhito janān//

It is thus translated by Whitney and Lannman:—'They that are kings, king-makers, that are charioteers and troop-leaders—subjects to me do thou, O *parṇā*, make all people round about.' For discussion of this point see the author's forth-coming work *Hindu Public Life*, etc.

22 For different interpretations of *sūta* see *VI. s.v.*

Another official title now used for the first time, although in a metaphorical sense, is *sthapati*. In two charms (II. 32. 4 and V. 23. 11) for the destruction of worms we are told how the king as well as the *sthapati* of these creatures had been killed.[23] The precise significance of *sthapati* is uncertain and it has been variously translated as governor, judge and general. In either case the addition of a new official title would signify the growth of the administrative machine.

Coming to the minor officers of the royal household, we find that the Ṛgvedic *kṣattṛ* ('distributor of food') is mentioned figuratively in III. 24. 7 where at the end of a harvest song two *Kṣattṛs* of the God Prajāpati are invoked for fatness and plenty. The literal use of *kṣattṛ* is illustrated in V. 17. 12 ff. where among the blessings denied to a Kṣatriya in whose kingdom a Brahmin dame is detained is mentioned a golden-necklaced (*niṣkagrīva*) *kṣattrā* along with a beautiful wife, a broad headed ox (?), a black-courser and so forth.

Another officer of the same humble rank as the *kṣattṛ* who now emerges into notice is the *pariveṣṭṛ* ('attendant'). In course of a hymn exalting the entertainment of guests we are told (IX. 6. 1-2) in highly metaphorical language that the *kṣattṛ* 'answering to the householder's summons just answers the summons as an *agnīdh* while the *pariveṣṭṛs* with drinking-vessels in their hands are just priests managing the Soma cups.

The *AV.* gives us a few glimpses of the authors' views of the characteristics of a good administration. That exertion and self-restraint were qualities expected from a king appears from XI. 5. 17 where we read that the king protects his realm by *tapas* and *brahmacarya*.[24] In the delightful pen-picture of a happy pair basking under the benign rule of king Parikṣit, we gather that the test of a good administration was held to be the peace and prosperity of the humble subject. In this story (XX. 127. 7-10) the husband, while ordering his house, tells his wife 'Mounting his throne, Parikṣit, best of all, hath given us peace and rest,' while the wife replies in words bespeaking the abundance of her simple household, "Which shall I set before thee, curds, gruel of milk or barley brew?"[25]

U. N. Ghoshal

23 *hato rājā krimīṇāmutaiṣāṃ sthapatir hataḥ.* On the interpretation of *sthapati* see *VI. s.v.*

24 *brahmacaryeṇa tapasā rājā rāṣṭraṃ vi rakṣati.*

25 Griffith's tr.

Early Nineteenth Century Chinese Studies in Bengal

The English evangelical movement of the 18th century, commonly attributed in its origins to the Wesleys and George Whitefield, affected parts of the world exceedingly remote from England. By 1792, the year of John Wesley's death, the evangelical spirit had replaced seventeenth century Puritanism in practically all the old dissenting denominations of England. New, purely evangelical sects also arose, and, last, but not least, the Established Church accepted the new emotionalism. The generation succeeding Wesley brought this evangelical attitude to its highest expression. To the Englishmen of that generation, the propagation of the Gospel appeared to be even more obligatory than the spread of *liberté, égalité, et fraternité* to the Frenchmen of the same era. Accordingly, while French armies were endeavouring to secure the 'Rights of Man' by force in Europe, English arms were no less intent upon subduing vast areas in Asia, so that, according to evangelical spokesmen of the last decade of the 18th century and the early decades of the 19th, the Word of God might be spread among the heathen. Both French and English believed they were benefitting their fellow men, and both alike thus defended their respective uses of imperialism. The study of Chinese in Bengal, except for two short papers written by Sir William Jones for the *Asiatic Researches*, vol. II,[1] was intimately connected with the British crusade, as was the study of that language in Canton by Robert Morrison, though Morrison commenced his work a little later.

I

The generation of greatest evengelical enthusiasm in England, not only coincided with that of the study of Chinese in the cities of Calcutta and

1 Jones, William, *On the Second Classical Book of the Chinese*, (*Asiatic Researches*, II, 195-204) published 1792 but written 1785. Also *7th Anniversary Discourse* delivered 25th Feb. 1790, by the President (Jones), entitled, *On the Chinese* (*Asiatic Researches*, II, 365-381), 1792.

Jones' work was used by the Baptist missionaries in their work later. Its significance to the present subject is slight, since Jones never seriously studied the Chinese language. At all events, his work represents an unconnected effort of the 18th century, bearing little relation to that of the century which is the subject of the present paper.

Serampore in Bengal, but was largely responsible for it. In rapid succession, after the year of Wesley's death many new Missionary and Bible Societies were formed.[2] In 1792 the Baptist Missionary Society was founded. In 1795 the London Missionary Society was established, and in 1799 the Church Missionary Society. In 1804 the British and Foreign Bible Society followed.

In Bengal, during this time, there had been certain debates over the manner in which the East India Company ought to provide education for persons in its civil service. In 1780 Warren Hastings had established a Muhammadan Madrassa in Calcutta[3] to train young Indian Muhammadans for employment in the Company's Government, and in 1792 a Hindu Patshalla[4] had been opened in Benares under Cornwallis for the same reason. At the same time Cornwallis, through the influence of two pronounced evangelicals, Charles Grant, a Highland Scot,[5] and Sir John Shore, the successor to Conrwallis in the office of Governor General, had caused legislation to be enacted by which Europeans alone remained eligible for worthwhile Government positions. Grant had then gone home to advocate Christian missions and English education for the people of India.[6]

David Brown, a disciple of Joseph Milner, the evangelical divine in charge of the Hull Grammar school,[7] which young David attended prior to

2 The two old Societies still existed, but had become almost moribund. These were the S.P.C.K. and the S.P.G.

3 S. C. Sanial, *History of the Calcutta Madrassa* (*Bengal Past and Present*, VIII, 1914), 83. Charles Lushington, *History, Design, and Present State of the Religious, Benevolent, and Charitable Institutions founded by the British in Calcutta* (Calcutta, 1824), 124, 135. H. Sharp, *Selections from the Educational Records, Government of India* (Calcutta, 1920), I, 8. This last quotes the *Minute* of Warren Hastings giving the correct date and the particulars.

4 Letter: Duncan to Cornwalllis, Benares, Jan. 1, 1792 (*Bengal Past and Present*, VIII, 1914), 130-33.

5 H. Morris, *Life of Charles Grant, passim.*

6 In 1792 he composed a long treatise entitled, *Observations on the State of Society among the Asiatic Subjects of Great Britain, particularly with respect to morals, and on the Means of improving it.* See *Report Select Committee, House of Commons 1831-32* (734) viii, App. I.

7 Brown's dates are 1763-1812. *Panoplist* IX, Dec. 1813, 558-9, *Obituary*. Also *Panoplist* XI, Nov. 1815, 489-95; *Missionary Register*, Jan. 1814, and Feb. 1823. J. Mayhall, *The Annals of Yorkshire......*, I, 189. Milner and his better known brother Isaac were selected for special reference by J. H. Overton, *The Evangelical Revival*, 80-82.

matriculation in Magdalene College, Cambridge,[8] had gone out to Calcutta as a Company chaplain in 1785. There he became a friend of Grant and Shore. In 1796 he became Presidency chaplain, the highest clerical post in India at that time. He was joined in Calcutta by Claudius Buchanan in 1797. Buchanan, a Scot like Grant, had come under the influence of the evangelical Isaac Milner, brother of Joseph, during his schooling at Cambridge University. He was also the protégé of the Reverend John Newton, who had become devout while engaging in the African slave trade. Newton had interceded with John Thornton, the evangelical trustee of the Bank of England, to enable Buchanan to get his higher education.[9]

When Governor General Wellesley[10] in 1800 had acquired sufficient leisure from his "wars of defence" against the State of Mysore to take stock of the educational facilities in the Bengal Presidency, he perceived the anomaly that had been bequeathed to him by his predecessors, Cornwallis and Shore. There were institutions in existence for the education of Muhammadans and Hindus for the civil service, but it was illegal for these native youths to hold the positions for which they were trained. At the same time, no special education was required of the English boys who entered the service. The situation was so bad that Wellesley instituted a drastic cure. He consulted Brown and Buchanan as to the proper steps to be taken, and determined to establish a college in Calcutta to train English civil servants. Buchanan was entrusted with the details, and drew up the plan of the College of Fort William.[11] Brown was appointed Provost and Buchanan Vice-Provost.[12]

It was shortly after this event that these two chaplains first interested themselves in the Chinese language. Buchanan wrote:

8 E. K. Purnell, *University of Cambridge College Histories, Magdalene College,* 177.

9 Hugh Pearson, *Memoirs of the Life and Writings of the Rev. Claudius Buchanan,* 40, 43, 102. Letters of Buchanan, *op. cit.,* 82, 83, 103.

10 He was then Lord Mornington, but is so well known under his title of Wellesley that it is hardly worth while to make the distinction here.

11 Letter: Buchanan to Charles Grant, June, 1800. Pearson, *op. cit.,* (N.Y. 1818), 144. "Lord Wellesley is at present engaged in founding a College for the instruction of the young civil servants in the eastern literature and general learning. He desired me to draw out a sketch of the constitution of the College; which I did. And now Mr. Barlow has instructed me to draw up a Minute as a justification of the measure."

12 *Idem.*

"The means of obtaining a version of the Scriptures in the Chinese language occupied the minds of the Superintendents of the College of Fort William, at an early period. It appeared an object of the utmost importance to procure an erudite Professor who should undertake such a work, for, if but a single copy of the Scriptures could be introduced into China, they might be transcribed in almost every part of that immense empire. Another object in view was to introduce some knowledge of the Chinese Language among ourselves; for although the Chinese Forts on the Tibetan frontier overlook the Company's territories in Bengal, there was not a person, it was said, in the Company's service in India, who could read a common Chinese letter."[13]

The search, instituted by these two officials of Fort William College, ended in 1805[14] when Joannes Lassar, an Armenian Christian born in Macao,[15] was procured. Lassar came of a comparatively wealthy family, and, as a boy, had shown special adaptability for the Chinese language. His parents had permitted him to indulge this taste and had employed two Chinese school-masters; the one to teach him "the Chinese and the other the Mandarine language; the former receiving 30 dollars monthly, the latter 35."[16] Young Lassar had dismissed his "Chinese teacher,"[17] in a few days, since that individual, in what was described as the Chinese manner, had begun by "compelling him to commit to memory a vast number of characters, and leaving him to divine the meaning of them." Under the "Mandarine master," Lassar studied night and day and, while still a youth, had finished forty volumes of Chinese, most of which he had likewise memorized. After that he pursued his studies alone, since he was able to make full use of "those excellent dictionaries which the Chinese possess." During this time the Portuguese at Macao employed him in conducting their official correspondence with the Court at Peking.[18] At age twenty-three, Lassar temporarily abandoned scholarship for trade, and sailed with a large cargo

13 Claudius Buchanan, *Christian Researches*, (London, 1811) 9.

14 Joshua Marshman, *Elements of Chinese Grammar with a preliminary dissertation on the character and the colloquial medium of the Chinese* (Serampore, 1914), ii. Lassar was engaged in teaching Chinese early in 1806. (Letter: Carey to Morris, dated Feb. 7, 1806, *Baptist Periodical Accounts* III (London, 1806), 223. Presumably he was in Calcutta for some months during the negotiations between himself and Buchanan and the Baptists. Carey's letter speaks as though the instruction had been going on for a short time before Feb. 7.

15 Letter: Marshman to Ryland (*Baptist Periodical Accounts* III, 461). Letter not dated, but seems to have been written in 1807.

16 *Ibid.*, 462.

17 Probably a teacher of Cantonese.

18 Letter: Marshman to Ryland, *op. cit.*, 462. Buchanan, *op. cit.*, 10.

of tea to Calcutta. He discovered, to his embarrassment, that the tea market was overstocked, and so was obliged to sell at a great loss. His financial difficulties somehow brought him into contact with the Reverend David Brown, the Provost of Fort William Colllege, who, providentially for Lassar, was looking for a Chinese scholar.

The years 1805 and 1806 were extremely difficult ones for the College, since the Court of Directors of the Company in London had several times indicated their displeasure at the Wellesley institution,[19] so Brown was unable to engage Lassar directly as Professor of Chinese. For this reason the young Armenian was hired in a private character, at the salary of £450 a year, or 300 Rs. a month.[20] Lassar at once entered upon the principal task assigned to him, namely, the translation of the Armenian Bible into Chinese.[21] In 1807 he had completed the translation of the Gospel of St. Matthew, which, in his own hand-writing, was sent to the Archbishop of Canterbury to be deposited in the Lambeth Library.[22] Chinese studies in Bengal received official approval in 1808 when Governor General Minto, in a speech made at the "Annual Disputations" at the College of Fort William, congratulated Lassar upon his work.[23] By 1811, the larger part of the New Testament

19 The Directors had twice ordered the College closed prior to 1806, but it had remained open on the excuse of awaiting further orders from England. In 1806-7 the Directors decided to allow the College to continue for the sole purpose of teaching the languages required for the government of India, namely Persian, Arabic, Sanskrit, and some of the vernacular Indian languages. The East India College at Haileybury in England was then established to give European education to the prospective civil servants. See G. S. A. Ranking, *The College of Fort William (Bengal Past and Present,* VII), 22 f. Also Letter: Buchanan to Grant, Calcutta, Aug. 22, 1803. Pearson, *Life of Buchanan,* 186. Also *Memorials of Old Haileybury College, Passim.*

20 Buchanan, *op. cit.,* 10. Marshman to Ryland, *op. cit.,* 464.

21 Letter: Carey to Morris, Feb. 1806 (*Baptist Periodical Accounts,* III, 223). Letter of Brown, Sept. 13, 1806 (*British and Foreign Bible Society, 3d. Report,* 1807, 154). Brown thought highly of Lassar's Chinese scholarship.

22 Buchanan, *op. cit.,* 11. *2d. Report British and Foreign Bible Society,* 1806, 77. First reference to beginning of work. Also see *5th Report British and Foreign Bible Society,* 1809, 213. Chinese Gospel of St. Matthew deposited in the British and Foreign Bible Society's Library.

23 Letter: Brown to Buchanan (Pearson's *Life of Buchanan,* 409). Quotes speech of Minto, Feb. 21, 1808. "I must not omit to commend the zealous and persevering labours of Mr. Lassar, and of those learned and pious men associated with him, who have accomplished for the future benefit, we may hope, of that

was not only translated, but printed in the Chinese manner from wooden blocks. A catalogue, drawn up by Buchanan prior to 1811, of the Bibliotheca Biblica, established at the College of Fort William, included the "Scriptures in Chinese," translated by Mr. Joannes Lassar.[24]

The evangelical members of the Established Church in Calcutta had thus contributed to the promotion of Chinese studies in Bengal in three ways. They had conceived the need for a Chinese scholar whose translation of the Bible they optimistically supposed might evangelize China; they had discovered the scholar and financed his work; and finally, they had secured a translation of part of the Scriptures. The rest of the story lies mainly with the Baptist Missionary Society.

II

The Baptist Missionary Society, as mentioned earlier, was formed in 1792. The following year, in spite of the East India Company's legal ban, the Society had sent a mission to Bengal, consisting of Messrs. Thomas and Carey. Carey, who played a minor rôle in the history of Chinese studies in Bengal, since he was the father of a member of the first class in Chinese, was the son of a schoolmaster, as was his father also. Young Carey, however, had not risen above the position of cobbler's assistant, when in 1783 he joined the Baptist church.[25] He continuously agitated for missionary work from that year forward,[26] and, in 1792, when the Baptist Missionary Society was formed,[27] he was selected to accompany Mr. John Thomas,[28] who had once been in India, to Bengal. The principal drawback was Carey's wife. Mrs. Carey had never fancied a missionary career, and rather justly refused to accompany her husband. She would not have gone, had Carey been allowed to sail on the British East Indiaman in which he had at first secured

immense and populous region, Chinese versions in the Chinese character, of all the Gospels of Matthew, Mark, and Luke, throwing open that precious mine, with all its religious and moral treasures, to the largest associated population in the world." Minto also contributed a handsome sum to further this work.

24 Buchanan, *op. cit.*, 224-5. Other translations had been made in Arabic, Persian, Hindustānī, Sanskrit, Marāthī, Oriyā, and Bengalī.

25 *Baptist Periodical Accounts*, I, 1800, 1-2.

26 *Idem.* 27 *Idem.*

28 *Ibid.*, 7-8. Thomas rendered a long account of himself which appears on pages 12-22 in *B.P.A.*

passage.[29] The delay, caused by the necessity for securing another passage,[30] enabled Carey's friends to win Mrs. Carey over to the missionary cause, so that she at last consented to pack up her family of small children and sail. The youngest of them, Jabez Carey, must have been a babe in arms, since he was just fifteen years old in 1808, when he underwent his first examination in Chinese.[31] In India, Carey accomplished almost nothing between 1793 and 1799. He was then persuaded by new Baptist arrivals to take up residence at Serampore,[32] a Danish settlement near Calcutta. There were also political reasons for such a change of residence, since it was feared that Wellesley, Shore's successor in the office of Governor General, might not continue to wink at the breach of Company policy regarding missionaries as Shore had done.

Among the new Baptist arrivals of 1799 was John Marshman. Marshman, unlike most of his fellows in Serampore, had received a reasonably thorough education in England prior to his "baptism." He had been a schoolmaster at Broadmead, and had acquired some knowledge of Latin, Greek, Hebrew, and Arabic. Like Carey, he sailed for India with a wife just past childbirth, and a family of small children.[33] Marshman, shortly after his arrival at Serampore, mastered Sanskrit and Bengali sufficiently well to translate the Bible into those languages prior to the year 1806.[34] In January of that year, the vice-Provost of Fort William College, Claudius Buchanan, approached the missionaries at Serampore on the subject of Chinese studies. Buchanan offered to provide the teacher, Joannes Lassar, if any of the missionaries, or their children, were willing to learn. Carey, for his part, rejected the offer, but his son Jabez, then thirteen years of age, accepted. Marshman was also willing to undertake the study, and, with his

29 *Baptist Periodical Accounts,* I, 1800, 35 ff.

30 *Ibid.,* 45. Sailed on the *Princessa Maria,* Danish East Indiaman, June, 13, 1793.

31 *Report of the first examination in the Chinese Language,* held at Serampore, on the 10th of Feb. 1808 (*Bap. Per. Acc.,* III, 459-60). This report was signed by the Reverends David Brown and William Carey.

32 In the case of common place names such as Serampore, I shall preserve the Anglo-Indian spelling instead of using the identical transliteration, i.e. Serampūr.

33 *Baptist Periodical Accounts,* I, 504. Since his son, Benjamin, was only eight years old in Feb. 1808 (*Bap. Per. Acc.,* III, 461), Mrs. Marshman must have given him birth either on the voyage or just before the embarkation.

34 Buchanan, *op. cit.,* 225.

two sons, aged six and eleven, completed the first class in Chinese established in Bengal.[35] By mid-March, 1806, Marshman described the situation in the following words.

"I have begun the study of the Chinese language, and nearly committed to memory four hundred sentences. Mr. Lassar is an excellent teacher, and a man of ability. I have begun writing the language. John Marshman and Jabez Carey are my companions.[36] I can only say now that I find it perfectly attainable."[37]

In February 1808, the three children were given their first public examination, at which Brown and Carey were in attendance. John Clark Marshman, aged 13, was reported perfect in three elementary books containing a total of 2790 characters of which about a thousand were different from one another. He had also repeated "the whole five books of Lun-gnee (Lun-yü), or Conversations of Confucius, containing eight thousand characters." He had held a disputation in Chinese on the subject, "The Chinese language is not more difficult of acquisition than other languages," and had demonstrated his ability to write and construe Chinese from dictation. Jabez Carey, aged fifteen years, had done about the same tasks, and Benjamin Wickes Marshman, aged eight years, had completed more than half the work done by his older brother. The examination closed with an essay read by Dr. Marshman on the ease by which Chinese might be acquired, and a speech by Lassar in praise of Chinese language and literature. Prizes, appointed by Claudius Buchanan, were then distributed among the boys by Mr. Lassar.[38] The proficiency of this small class in Serampore, is perhaps the more remarkable, since at this time Lassar was having as much difficulty with the English language as his students with Chinese.[39]

In the meantime the Missionaries were anxious to see greater progress with the principal task in hand, namely the translation of the Bible. Marshman, himself, was impatiently waiting for the time when he might personally take a hand in the work. In May 1808, only three months after

35 *Ibid.*, 11. When Buchanan wrote this, he said that the three Marshmans and Jabez Carey had been studying Chinese "with unremitted attention for about five years." Also see Marshman, *Grammar, op. cit.*, ii.

36 Apparently the smaller boy, Benjamin Wicks Marshman, was receiving less rigorous training at the beginning.

37 Letter: Marshman to Ryland, March, 14, 1806. (*Bap. Per. Acc.*, III, 224).

38 *Report of the First Examination in the Chinese language held at Serampore*, on the 10th of February, 1808 (*Baptist Periodical Accounts*, III, 459).

39 Marshman, *Grammar, op. cit.*, ii.

the examination just described, he began to search for a means of printing his own and Lassar's translations. A Chinese artist was secured, and certain Bengalis who were skilled in cutting the patterns of flowers used in printing cotton fabrics, were employed under the artist's supervision to cut Chinese characters in blocks made from the wood of the Tamarind tree.[40] In 1809 matters had progressed to a point where the missionaries were printing a revised version of the Gospel of St. Matthew in octavo on one side of the page only, "after the manner of the Chinese." To insure greater accuracy in the work, an additional learned Chinese was employed at £4 a month plus his room and board to examine the translations independently with Marshman. Even this precaution failed to satisfy the indefatigable missionary linguist who, in later years, developed a much more thorough system.[41]

The same year Marshman published a translation and text of the Lun-yü, with a dissertation on the Chinese language.[42] This singular volume of 876 folio pages was admittedly a brave pioneering effort,[43] apparently so replete with error that a commentator writing in 1822 was led to remark, "A translation of the Lun-yü was published by a gentleman in Bengal in 1809. This translation appears to have been made under very considerable disadvantages, and there is no doubt, but, were that gentleman to publish a second edition, very important alterations and improvements would be made; perhaps an entirely new version would be desirable."[44] Marshman dedicated his first work in Chinese to Governor General Minto, and commented briefly upon the priority of French studies of that language.

40 *A Second Memoir of the State of the Translation of the Scriptures, in a letter to the Society* (*Baptist Periodical Accounts*, Nov. 1809, IV, 54-56).

41 *Ibid.*, 55-6. Also Report on Translations, IV, 111. Also *British and Foreign Bible Society, 1st Report*, iv. Chinese Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Mark were published at Serampore in 1810. Morrison's first translation, the Chinese Acts of the Apostles came out in 1811.

42 J. Marshman, *The Works of Confucius containing the Original Text with a translation, to which is prefixed a dissertation on the Chinese Language and Character*, I, (Serampore, 1809).

43 Letter: Marshman, Serampore, Dec. 1813. *Eleventh Report of the British and Foreign Bible Society*, App. LXXIII, 471. Marshman says with suitable humility, "Of course, the translation of Confucius, within a little time after my engaging in it, *with all its faults*, was my own."

44 *Indo-China Gleaner*, 1822, 279.

"The interests of the English nation, no less than its literary honor," he said, demanded English study of Chinese. Minto's munificent donations for Chinese studies were also justly acknowledged. Two large folded tables at the beginning of the volume exhibited and explained the radicals and tones. A life of Confucius, translated from Chinese classics, occupied the opening forty pages. Marshman apparently made every effort to consult the works of earlier Europeans, and did secure reference to D'Anville[45] and Du Halde.[46] He also had the advice of a Catholic missionary from Macao named Rodriguez,[47] who visited Serampore for some months, and from whom Marshman obtained a Latin-Chinese dictionary in manuscript which had been begun in 1724 by the Catholic Missionaries in Peking, and had been in the making for more than eighty years. The text, translation, and an extremely extensive commentary, together with the dissertation upon the Chinese language completed the book.

The close of 1811 marked the end of the elementary stage of Chinese studies in Bengal. The class of four had reached the point where independent work might be done. A method of printing had been devised, and a portion of a Chinese classic had been published with text and translation, and circulated in England and the United States.[48] Finally, more in line with missionary endeavours, the first two Gospels of the New Testament had been published in Chinese, and an approach to a scientific method of translation into Chinese had been devised.[49]

III

Two events which occurred successively in 1812 and 1813 first retarded, and then accelerated the general work of translation and printing by the missionaries at Serampore. The work in Chinese was as much affected as that in the twenty-odd Indic languages. On March 11, 1812, fire destroyed

45 Marshman, *Works of Confucius,* I, i, note.

46 *Ibid.*, xxxi, xxxviii n.

47 *Idem.*

48 Marshman's work was donated to the Andover Seminary in Massachusetts as soon as it was published. It is now available in the Andover-Harvard library.

49 M. Abel-Rémusat. *Sur les traductions de la Bible en langue Chinoise, traduction de l'Évangile Saint-Marc* (1811) (*Mélanges Asiatiques,* (Paris, 1825) I, 1-26). On page 17 Abel-Rémusat compares the work of Marshman and Morrison as follows: "Si pourtant l'on voulait caractériser le fruit des veilles de ces deux interprètes de livres saints, on pourrait dire que la version de Sirampour est plus litérale, et que celle de Canton est plus conforme au goût chinoise."

the Baptist printing establishment. The heavy and expensive presses were saved, and the steel punches, which were used in making metal types for Indian languages, were recovered after the fire had destroyed the building, quantities of paper, and fourteen founts, including the Chinese.[50] Exceedingly liberal donations from England and the United States put the printing establishment back in order in less than six months, and, as Marshman observed, the destruction which the fire had wrought had eliminated many old errors that might have persisted. The encouraging event, from the Baptist point of view, was the passage of the East India Charter of 1813 which contained the so-called "pious clauses" legalizing missionary residence in India.

Chinese studies now became more mature, though the principal interests were still evangelical with a slightly imperialistic tinge. The same report that described the fire remarked upon the importance of cultivating Chinese in Bengal where there was complete freedom from "the extreme jealousy with which the Chinese watch over the printing of every book in China."[51] Marshman had said in 1809[52] that the "interests" of the British nation were to be served by the study of Chinese in Bengal. In 1813 he said further,

> "And consider how many myriads of copies will be required in the course of years, the wisdom of God seems to appear, in thus establishing a press secure from all interruption from all Chinese edicts and mandates, in a place from whence the Chinese Scriptures can be continually sent to the Burman Empire, Java, Amboyna, Penang, and the Isles of the Sea, and thence find their way into the heart of the Chinese Empire."[53]

He and his three youthful colleagues, together with Lassar and the two Chinese assistants set to work with renewed zeal. The publication of Robert Morrison's first edition of the Chinese New Testament in 1813,[54] no doubt constituted an additional reason for their increased activity.

50 *Address from the Baptist Missionaries*, Serampore, Aug. 31, 1811, (*Ninth Report, British and Foreign Bible Society*, App. XXXIX, 1813, 508).

51 *Ibid.*, 506.

52 *Supra*, 10.

53 Letter of Marshman, Serampore, Dec. 1813 (*11tht Report British and Foreign Bible Society*, App. LXXIII, 1815, 474).

54 Letter: Morrison to British and Foreign Bible Soc., (*11th Report, British and Foreign Bible Society*, App. VIII, 1815, 333). A certain rivalry grew up between the Canton-Malacca *versus* the Serampore students of Chinese. Morrison was a London Missionary man, and, although his Chinese Grammar was printed at Serampore, his letters to the British and Foreign Bible Society never mention

The principal improvements of the period between 1812 and 1818, when the Serampore missionaries reached their greatest efficiency, were in printing and revision. Revision normally should be treated first, but the printing improvements appear to have antedated it. In both departments Marshman and his colleagues appear to have been infinitely more painstaking than their contemporary translations of Chinese, Morrison and Milne. Whether their pains were rewarded with a superior product can only be decided upon by a competent Sinologist.[55]

Shortly before the Serampore fire, experiments had been begun with metal moveable types to replace the Tamarind wood blocks. It was this new metal fount which had been destroyed by the fire.[56] This was soon replaced by a new set with which the missionaries expected to print a third revision of the Gospel of St. John, the first Chinese printing in metal in Serampore. They also held the opinion that in no very long time they would "be enabled to excel the Chinese themselves in beauty of printing."[57] In addition to beauty, the types were said to be cheap, and to possess greater facility of use than wood blocks.[58] By the end of 1813 Marshman was so confident of the superiority of his metal moveable types that he predicted that the entire cost of moveable types to cover the printing of the complete Bible would be "scarcely a quarter of that of having them cut in wood, either in China or Bengal." He further asserted that if this cost were smaller on the initial

Marshman and his work. Marshman, on the other hand, several times extended a fraternal hand in Morrison's direction.

55 Abel-Rémusat, *op. cit., passim.* This French savant was much more critical of Marshman's work than of Morrison's.

56 *Supra,* 11-12.

57 Address from the Baptist Missionaries, Serampore, Aug. 31, 1812 (*9th Report of the British and Foreign Bible Society,* II, 1813, 506). Abel-Rémusat, *Observations sur un Ouvrage de M. Marshman, intitulé Clavis Sinica* (*Mélanges Asiatique,* II, 132-151), 151. The metal types were a definite improvement according to this reference.

58 Address from the Baptist Missionaries, Serampore, Aug. 31, 1812 (*9th Report British and Foreign Bible Society,* II, 1813, App. XXXIX, 506). "The expense will be reduced almost beyond belief; the types requisite to print both the Old and the New Testament will scarcely amount to £400 sterling. In addition, however, to beauty and cheapness, the moveable metal types possess the inestimable advantage of admitting corrections in the edition to any extent, as the trouble of setting up a double page anew is scarcely equal to that of transcribing it, much less of cutting it anew in wood."

fount, it would be practically negligible, in comparison, for revised editions. The cheapness of labour in Bengal, while not an argument for moveable types, was cited as an argument for doing the work in India instead of China, since, in Marshman's opinion, labour could be had at one third the cost.[59] In 1814, a copy of St. John's Gospel printed with metal moveable types in Serampore, was presented to the library of the British and Foreign Bible Society.[60] In 1815, perhaps in reply to queries respecting the use of metal types at Serampore, Morrison, without mentioning the Bengal translations, as it was apparently not his policy to do, sent in a long opinion in favour of wood blocks, and stated that the wages of "Chinese labourers and mechanics" were between three and six Chinese dollars a month.[61] In the same year the Baptists reported again that they could print Scriptures at a third the cost in China, and reaffirmed their faith in metal moveable types. This time they stated outright that the Bengali labour came at a little more than one third the price of Chinese labour.[62] By 1816 the Baptists had four Chinese metal founts of various sizes and had reached the stage of printing on both sides of the paper, thus accomplishing an additional saving, both in paper and binding costs.[63] If Morrison had challenged the Bengal translators on the score of cost, he had said nothing in regard to Marshman's claim of the greater durability[64] of metal over wood, which, regardless of initial cost would make for cheaper operation in the long run.

The problem of revision of the Chinese Bible translation to produce a completely faithful copy was a source of considerable worry and extra work for the Serampore missionaries. In the early period, prior to the fire, Marshman had been content with a triple check on his work, but by 1813 he had evolved a system which included the making and checking of twelve separate

59 Letter of Marshman, Serampore, Dec. 1813 (*11th Report British and Foreign Bible Society*, App. LXXIII, 1815, 473-4).

60 *Eleventh Report, op. cit.*, 270, 503.

61 If four Chinese dollars then equalled one pound as Morrison's figures seem to indicate, then the wages would be between ¾ths to 1¼ pounds per month. In Bengal at this time, an ordinary Bengali artisan received from 4 to 8 Rs. or 8 to 16 Shillings. See also Letter of Morrison, Canton, Nov. 4, 1815 (*12th Report British and Foreign Bible Society*, App. LIX, 221).

62 Memoir of translation by Baptist Missionaries at Serampore, Jan. 1815 (*12th Report, op. cit.*, App. LX, 226).

63 *13th Report, British and Foreign Bible Society*, App. VI, 11.

64 Letter of Marshman, Serampore, Dec. 1813, *op. cit.*, (*11th Report*, 1815), 474.

printed impressions of each sheet, each corrected before the next was printed. This was another advantage of his metal moveable types over wood blocks. The most difficult part of this tedious process was the original translation in which Lassar and John Clark Marshman, as well as the Chinese assistants, collaborated. The elder Marshman's knowledge of classical languages, here came in very well, since he was able to compare the Chinese translations verse for verse with the original Greek, and make corrections arising from any faulty understanding of the English idiom.[65] Two Chinese-Latin Dictionaries were used in this checking. Towards the end of this process each of the seven individuals who were familiar with Chinese checked a separate clean copy of the double page under consideration, after which all findings were pooled and adjusted in a joint meeting. The strongly evangelical attitude of the translators was expressed by Marshman when he said, "By means of this scrutiny, I cannot but hope that a faithful version of the Holy Scriptures in the Chinese language, will, at length, be produced. The importance of presenting the Word of Life faithfully and perspicuously expressed, to two or three hundred millions of perishing sinners, when I duly realize it......causes me to feel a joy I cannot describe."[66]

It was at this time and in the same letter quoted above, that Marshman first appears to have taken cognizance of Morrison's[67] work in Canton, though this recognition apparently was never reciprocated. The independence of the work of the Canton and Serampore translators, Marshman thought, was calculated to hasten the ultimate perfection of European accuracy in Chinese translation. Morrison's work was referred to once more in 1815, when the Baptist report remarked, "We were requested to

65 Marshman's Letter (See citation below) mentions the constant use of Griesback. I assume he meant Johan J. Griesback's *Commentarius Criticus in Textem Graecum Novi Testamenti*, 1798-1811.

66 Letter of Marshman, Serampore, Dec. 1813 (*11th Report British and Foreign Bible Society*, App. LXXIII, 1815, 473).

67 *Idem*. "And I cannot but view it as a part of divine wisdom, to put it into the hearts of two persons, labouring independently of each other, (Morrison and myself) thus to care for the Translation of the Sacred Scriptures into a language so peculiar in its nature, and understood by such multitudes of men. Should we have wisdom given us rightly to profit by each other's labours, I suppose the translation of the Scriptures will be brought to as great a perfection in twenty years, as they might have been in the hand of one alone in the space of fifty."

print brother Morrison's *Grammar*."[68] This work had been sent to Calcutta in 1812 or 1813[69] to be printed at the expense of the East India Company.[70]

In 1814, the year preceding the publication of Morrison's *Grammar* at Serampore, Marshman's was published. The fact that Marshman's *Grammar* was in the press when Morrison's arrived, undoubtedly caused the delay in the publication of the latter, which so puzzled Morrison's biographer.[71] Marshman's work was primarily based upon a study of written Chinese,[72] both in the classical and popular styles, while Morrison was concerned with the language as it was spoken. Marshman likewise entered into numerous historical and linguistic speculations, which Morrison carefully avoided. In addition to Lassar and his Chinese assistants, and to the Jesuit Rodriguez, who had given Marshman a Latin-Chinese Dictionary, Marshman was helped by Thomas Manning, who, after sojourning in China for a number of years, had come to Calcutta with his Chinese teacher in 1810.[73] Manning's teacher had studied in Peking, which enabled Marshman to obtain a better knowledge of the Peking pronunciation, and of the tones. He found a dissertation on the Indo-Chinese languages by Dr. Leyden valuable,[774] and also certain Indic works of Colebrooke and Bentley with reference to Buddhism.[75] Two works which he discovered were chiefly

68. *Extract of A Memoir, relative to the Progress of the Translation of the Sacred Scriptures at Serampore, in the year 1815 (13th Report British and Foreign Bible Society,* App. VI, 12).

69 Morrison, Eliza A. *Memoirs of the Life and Labours of Robert Morrison* (London, 1839), I, 298.

70 *Ibid.*, 407. Morrison's *Diary*, May, 29, 1814. "Received accounts that the Bengal Government had determined to print on English paper 500 copies of my Chinese Grammar. . The work should cost 6,000 rupees, and the paper 800 to 1,200." (Total is *ca.* Rs. 7,000 or £700.

71 *Ibid.*, 298.

72 Henri Maspero, *La Chaire de Langues et Littérature chinoises et Tartares-Mandchoues (Extrait du Livre jubilaire compose à l'occasion du Quatrième du Collège de France)*, (Paris, 1932) 357. Also M. Abel-Rémusat, *op. cit.*, 132-151. Abel-Rémusat was exceedingly critical of Marshman's Grammar, saying, among other things, that Marshman had written only a Grammar of ancient Chinese, a dead language of the classics.

73 Marshman, *Grammar*, iii.

74 J. Leyden, *On the Languages of the Indo-Chinese Nations* (*Asiatic Researches* X, 158-289).

75 Marshman, *Grammar*, xiii.

without value, but with which he made himself acquainted, were Fourmont's *Linguae Sinarum Grammatica*, and Bayer's *Museum Sinicum*.[76]

Marshman divided his *Grammar* into three main sections. The first was a general discussion of the Chinese language under two principal headings. One discussed the characters, their supposed origin, development, composition, and number. The other covered various general subjects of which the most interesting to an Indian historian is the division of the languages of India and Eastern Asia into Sanskrit or Chinese cognates,[77] While his effort to link those two languages to a common origin was an obvious waste of time,[78] yet his speculation that the Buddha[78] and Confucius were contemporaries has been substantiated, as has his guess that Buddhism was the vehicle by which a large number of Indic loan words came into the Chinese language.[80] Marshman's second main division, called the Elements of Chinese Grammar discussed the various parts of speech in Chinese, and emphasized "position" as the primary grammatical consideration. This work, while it comprises the bulk of his volume, has nevertheless been superseded so long that it may be passed over without loss to the argument. The third and final section comprised the text of the Ta H'siao with a translation by John Clark Marshman. This was included as an exercise in reading and writing for prospective students who might make use of the grammar.

Besides this grammatical treatise, the Serampore press continually turned out translations of various sections of the Bible, which by 1818 had reached the second revised translation of the New Testament, and an original translation of the Pentateuch.[81] The entire Bible had also been translated by that year, but the printing was not completed until 1823.[82]

The period from 1812 to 1818 was by far the most important for Chinese studies in Serampore. Moveable metal type and scientific methods of translation had been put to use. A Chinese Grammar had been written, and two printed, in Serampore, and no less than nine seperate translations

76 Marshman, *Grammar*, xiv.

77 *Ibid.*, 146 ff.

78 *Ibid.*, 134 ff. The confusion of tongues of the Old Testament was cited as the reason for divergence. This Hebrew tale was a heritage which retarded effective comparative philology all through the 19th century.

79 *Ibid.*, 153 ff.

80 *Ibid.*, 170.

81 *15th Report, British and Foreign Bible Society*, lxxxi.

82 *Baptist Periodical Accounts*, 1824, 32-3.

of sections of the Bible were turned out.[83] The situation, therefore, seemed propitious for a continuation of Chinese studies in Bengal upon an even larger scale in the immediate future.

IV

Actually, however, Chinese studies in Bengal had all but run their course. In 1818 the Baptist Missionary Society was already on the verge of a schism. This was confirmed and ratified nine years later by the two parties to the quarrel. The bone of contention was a College which the missionaries desired to establish in Serampore, but which the home authorities in the Society in England regarded both as expensive and as extraneous to missionary work. From then on, home support dwindled. The British and Foreign Bible Society, too, lent less and less support to the Serampore translations, particularly after it became clear that Morrison's Anglo-Chinese College in Malacca was likely to be successful, so that from 1813 to 1823 the only notices vouchsafed to the Baptists in Serampore were in regard to the completion of the Chinese Bible they had begun. After 1823, neither the Baptist nor the Bible Society reports included reference to Chinese work done at Serampore. In one sense of the word, the task they had set out to do was completed, but one wonders that Marshman and his sons should have abandoned their studies of Chinese so peremptorily, considering the interest they had shown since 1806. The fate of their four Chinese metal founts is also left without record, and most remarkable of all, the distribution of the various translations they had printed is left unrecorded. In 1813 a supply of New Testaments from Serampore and from Malacca was sent to the St. Petersburg Auxiliary of the British and Foreign Bible Society, since there was a rumour that a "channel of conveyance was likely to be opened through Russia to the Chinese Empire."[84] But, apart from this isolated notice, the British and Foreign Bible Society, who appear to have been the principal agency for distributing the various translations in India and the Far East, does not remark upon making use of any of the Serampore Chinese publications.

83 See Contributions to the British and Foreign Bible Society in the 18th, 11th, 13th, and 15th *Annual Reports*. Five of these translations are available at the Andover Harvard library.

84 . *10th Report of the British and Foreign Bible Society*, 1814, 32.

If evangelical interest in the study of Chinese in India dwindled, so also did that of imperialism. In 1805 the Bengal Administration for an unexplained reason, had sought to inculcate the study of Chinese in the College of Fort William. Chinese Tibetan Forts in the Himālayas were mentioned and the *interests* and *honour* of the British nation referred to. Freedom from interference of Chinese edicts was another consideration mentioned, and Governor General Minto, who was generally hostile to missionary work, went out of his way to congratulate Joannes Lassar upon his Chinese translation of the Bible. Whether this political interest in Chinese studies in Bengal subsided as a result of the success of the Anglo-Chinese College in Malacca, which provided a base much nearer China for the unimpeded study of Chinese, is conjectural. At any rate, the East India officials ceased to pay further attention to Marshman and his work after Minto's regime had ended in 1813.

Whether this hitherto virtually unexplored[85] episode in the history of Chinese studies in the early nineteenth century had any significance important to the development of the East India Company's relationship with the Chinese Empire, is a matter for the student of Chinese history to decide. The fact remains that these studies were pursued actively in Bengal for nearly a generation, and that a considerable body of the literature which was printed at Serampore in Chinese and about Chinese survives today.

ELMER H. CUTTS

85 Cordier devoted a short paragraph to Marshman and his work in his *Histoire Générale de la Chine*, III, 425.

The Date of Caitanya-Caritāmṛta of Murāri Gupta

It is generally agreed that the *Śrī-Kṛṣṇa-caitanya-caritāmṛta* of Murāri-gupta is not free from spurious interpolation. But as to the nature of interpolation or the circumstances of its composition, there is much difference of opinion. Some hold that Murāri dealt with the early years of Caitanya's life of which he had a direct knowledge and that the accounts of Caitanya's later life, i.e. the accounts related after Śaka 1435 = (1513 A.D.) come from another source. Others think that Murāri is the author of the entire work but the verse which refers to its date of composition is spurious.

The latter view is so vigorously and plausibly set forth by Biman Bihari Majumdar in his *Śrī-Caitanya-cariter Upādā* that at present, scarcely a voice is raised against it. In accordance with the date of its compostion:

चतुर्दशशताब्दान्ते पञ्चत्रिंशतिवत्सरे ।
आषाढसितसप्तम्यां ग्रन्थोऽयं पूर्णतां गतः ॥ (iv/26/32)

the book should have ended before Śaka 1435 (= 1513 A.D.), that is, before the description of Caitanya's visit to Gauḍa on his frustrated journey to Mathurā, i.e. before the seventeenth canto of the third Prakrama, because Caitanya came to Gauḍa in Śaka 1435 after Vijayā-daśamī day.[1] But the book relates also incidents which occurred after Śaka 1435 = 1513 A.D. B. Majumdar who assigns the whole book to Murāri, holds that, as the book also mentions Caitanya's death तारयित्वा जगत् कृत्स्नं वैकुण्ठस्थैः प्रसाधितः । जगाम निलयं हृष्टो निजमेव महद्भिमत ॥ (i/2/14), it must have been written near about 1535 A.D.[2] According to B. Majumdar, the verse which gives the date of its composition, was subsequently interpolated with a view to adding to the authenticity of the book.[3] S. K. De has also doubted the genuineness of the entire book.[4] Sukumar Sen, who has apparently accepted the nucleus of the Kāvya as Murāri's, holds that the book was written *c.* 1520 A.D.[5]

Dinesh Chandra Sen believed that the latter portion of Murāri's Caitanya-caritāmṛta which records the incidents after Śaka 1435 was written

1 B. Majumdar, *Śrī-Caitanya-cariter Upādān*, p. 38.

2 *Op. cit.*, p. 76.

3 *Op. cit.*, p. 77.

4 S. K. De., *Early History of the Vaiṣṇava Faith and Movement in Bengal*, p. 28.

5 *Vaṅgaśrī*, 1341 B.C. Bhādra, pp. 194-95.

by some person other than Murāri. According to him, "it is natural to expect that if Dāmodara made any enquiry about the incidents of Caitanya's life to the veteran scholar, he must have done so regarding the childhood. For Dāmodara himself knew much more about the Master's later life as his constant companion at Purī than Murāri whose knowledge was mainly confined to Caitanya's early life at Nadia."[6]

In spite of the apparently convincing arguments that have been adduced by B. Majumdar in support of the genuineness of the nucleus of the Kāvya as Murāri's and the date of its composition two years after Caitanya's death, a careful study of the text and the information recorded in the subsequent biographies lead one to think that B. Majumdar is not correct, and earlier critics like Dinesh Chandra Sen, who had, of course, expressed his mere belief, were right in holding that the subsequent accounts of Caitanya's life were written by some other devotee. Those who hold that the extant text presents interpolated verses regarding Caitanya's later life and those who believe that the verse which refers to the date of its composition as spurious, have alike assumed that Murāri's work is associated with that of an author other than Murāri. In the printed text published by the *Amrita Bazar Patrika* Press, there can be little doubt of the hand of such an author other Murāri, but possibly the association of a second author, if established, will prove that even the portion dealing with the early history of Caitanya's life, which can be exclusively attributed to Murāri, is also not free from interpolations, although it is very difficult to mark out all the interpolated verses.

The association of a second author with Murāri's work can be established by the following considerations:

(1) Murāri-gupta admits in the first canto of the first Prakrama that he wrote the book at the request of Śrīvāsa, an ardent devotee of Caitanya:

भक्तः श्रीवासनामा द्विजकुलकमलप्रोल्लसच्चित्तभानुः ।
प्राहेदं श्रीमुरारिं त्वमिह वद हरेः श्रीचरितं नवीनम् ॥ (i/1/8)

Now, the word 'navīnaṃ' here appears to be important, and not merely ornamental. The word 'navīnaṃ' independently means 'fresh, new or young;' but the word should better be interpreted as 'young,' when it is attributed to a character. In the light of the meaning of the term 'navīnaṃ' as 'young,' we can infer that Śrīvāsa requested Murāri to write the account of Caitanya's *early* life with which the poet was intimately associated. The

6 Dinesh Chandra Sen, *Caitanya and his Age*, p. 60.

inference can also be supported by the argument that the enquiries by Dāmodara about Caitanya must have been with regard to his early life, of which he knew very little.[7] That Dāmodara, who knew much more about Caitanya's later life as his companion at Purī, would enquire about this phase of Murāri, whose knowledge was mainly confined to Caitanya's early life at Navadvīpa, seems curious. Another point should also be noted carefully. Dāmodara as one of the enquiring interlocutor in the work ceases to question Murāri after the eleventh canto of the third Prakrama. This somewhat strange silence of Dāmodara, in the whole fourth Prakrama of twenty-six cantos and in the last seven cantos of the third Prakrama, seems significant. Does it not indicate that Dāmodara, who knew much more about Caitanya's later life, enquired only of his early life and Murāri also narrated the early history of Caitanya's life?

(2) Kṛṣṇadāsa-Kavirāja, a subsequent biographer, specifically mentions in his *Caitanya-caritāmṛta* that Murāri wrote only about the early life of Caitanya and Svarūpa-Dāmodara recorded the later phase of Caitanya's life; and to them he admits his indebtedness (i/13/15-17):

आदिलीला-मध्ये प्रभुर यतेक चरित । सूत्ररूपे मुरारि गुप्त करिला ग्रथित ॥
प्रभुर मध्य-शेष लीला स्वरूप-दामोदर । सूत्र करि ग्रन्थिलेन ग्रन्थेर भितर ॥
एइ दुइजनेर सूत्र देखिया शुनिया । वर्णना करेन वैष्णव क्रम ये करिया ॥

To prove that nucleus of the book was composed by Murāri, B. Majumdar remarks by quoting the verse (*C.C.* i/13/46):

दामोदर-स्वरूप आर गुप्त मुरारि । मुख्य मुख्य लीला सूत्र लिखियाछे विचारि ॥

that perhaps Kṛṣṇadāsa-Kavirāja knew that Murāri had recorded the main

7 Dāmodara is not mentioned by any of the biographers in the list of the devotees who witnessed the Navadvīpa-līlā of Caitanya:

(a) Murāri does not mention Dāmodara's name in the first three Prakramas. Vṛndāvana-dāsa mentions his name for the first time after Caitanya's Sannyāsa (iii/3/185).

(c) Kṛṣṇadāsa also omits Dāmodara's name among the devotees who were intimately associated with Caitanya's early life at Navadvīpa.

(d) Kavikarṇapūra mentions Dāmodara's name for the first time in the 15th canto of his Kāvya (15/105).

(e) Locana mentions his name among the devotees lamenting over the departure of Caitanya for Sannyāsa (ii/61/l. 17). Like Locana Karṇapūra also mentions Dāmodara among the sorrowing devotees in his drama (iv/71). But as Murāri himself was present at that time, his account should be taken as authentic.

incidents not only of Caitanya's early life but of his whole life.[8] But this argument of B. Majumdar does not seem convincing. That Kṛṣṇadāsa, who refers to Murāri's recording of early life only (i/13/15-17), would immediately make in the same Adhyāya a contradictory statement, seems impossible. The lines need not be taken in a different way but should be interpreted to mean that Murāri and Dāmodara, who knew the earlier and later life of Caitanya respectively, gave an account of the chief incidents of each phase.

Again, Locana also bears testimony to the fact that Murāri described only the early life of Caitanya:

जन्म हैते वालक-चरित्र ये ये कैल ।
आद्योपान्ते यत यत प्रेम प्रचारिल ॥ (Sūtra-khaṇḍa, p. 4/1. 3-4)

The suggestion of D. C. Sen, that 'the second line seems to refer to the Vaiṣṇava love-cult preached by Caitanya during his stay at Navadvīpa,'[9] seems more plausible than any other interpretation.

Now the question may arise that if Murāri recorded Caitanya's early life only, then how Locana, who faithfully follows Murāri, could do so up to the 21st Canto of the fourth Prakrama, which ends with the incident of Bibhīṣaṇa and the Drāviḍa Brāhmin. Citing this instance of close resemblance B. Majumdar remarks[10] that unless Murāri had written the whole Kāvya, Locana, who wrote only fifty or sixty years after Murāri, could not have followed Murāri so closely. Without attempting, however, a critical analysis of the text, B. Majumdar also expresses his belief that the addition of verses in Murāri's work, within fifty or sixty years of Murāri's composition, seems improbable.[11] But this belief is based upon mere conjecture. Locana's knowledge up to the 21st Canto of the fourth Prakrama of Murāri's book does not establish the fact that Murāri himself wrote the whole Kāvya. The latter portion might have been added by some other writer before Locana wrote his *Caitanya-maṅgala*. B. Majumdar himself admits that hardly any book exists in Vaiṣṇava literature which is entirely free from interpolations.[12]

(3) Kavikarṇapūra in his *Caitanya-caritāmṛta* Mahākāvya professes to have drawn his materials and inspiration from Murāri's work:

8 B. Majumdar, *op. cit.*, p. 76.

9 D. C. Sen, *op. cit.*, p. 61 fn.

10 *Op. cit.*,pp. 73-74.

11 *Op. cit.*, p. 77.

12 *Op. cit.*, p. 76.

आशैशवं प्रभुचरित्रविलासविज्ञैः कैश्चिन्मुरारिरिति मङ्गलनामधेयैः
यद् यद्विलासललितं समलेखि तज्ज्ञैस् तद् तद्विलोक्य विलिलेख शिशुः स एष (20/42)

The last two lines give us the definite information that Karṇapūra recorded all the incidents which had been described by Murāri. But a comparative study of these two books would reveal that Karṇapūra followed Murāri closely up to Caitanya's journey to Nīlācala from Śāntipura after his Sannyāsa (*M.C.C.* 3/10), and partially up to the sixteenth canto of the third Prakrama. This gives a clear indication that Murāri did not record the later phase of Caitanya's life. B. Majumdar, who assigns the whole book to Murāri, suggests that Karṇapūra did not follow Murāri after the eleventh canto of his own Kāvya, because he gathered first-hand information from his father Śivānanda-sena, Vāsudeva-datta, his neighbour, Śrīvāsa and others.[43] But this argument of B. Majumdar is not convincing. If Karṇapūra had the entire present text before him, he would not have surely written यद् यद्विलासललितं समलेखि तज्ज्ञैस् तद् तद्विलोक्य विलिलेख शिशुः स एषः ॥ The lines definitely state that the incidents which Murāri had recorded were in their entirety utilised by Karṇapūra. Karṇapūra himself records in his work that Murāri went to Puri once with Śivānanda (13/127) and another time with other devotees (14/28), and seems to have definite knowledge that Murāri related the incidents of Caitanya's later life on the basis of the information received from Śrīvāsa, who requested him to write the Kāvya, and from other devotees of Navadvīpa, who used to visit Puri every year during Ratha-yātrā; it would seem strange that Karṇapūra did not accept at least some of the accounts of Caitanya's later life from Murāri's Kāvya. Even though the later phase of Caitanya's life is meagrely treated by Murāri-gupta, yet the present text gives more information than Karṇapūra's work does. For instance, we may cite Caitanya's first meeting with Rūpa and Sanātana at Rāmkeli (iii/18/1-2), his second meeting with Rūpa at Prayāga (iv/13/5), and Sanātana at Benares (iv/13/11), his meeting with Raghunātha-bhaṭṭa at Benares (iv/2/17), his meeting with Śacī Devī and Viṣṇupriyā at Navadvīpa (iv/14/4-9) on his way back from Vṛndāvana, which are some of the important items which Karṇapūra omits. It is curious that Karṇapūra, who so closely followed Murāri up to the 10th canto of the third Prakrama, did not relate these incidents if they were really recorded by Murāri himself who would till then have been alive. These differences in Murāri and

13 *Op. cit.*, p. 75.

Karṇapūra's works on the later life of Caitanya seems, in all probability, due to the fact that, the entire fourth Prakrama and also a few cantos of the third Prakrama were not before Karṇapūra when he wrote his Mahākāvya.

Again, the assumption that, because Karṇapūra received comparatively accurate information from Śivānanda, Vāsudeva-datta, Śrīvāsa and others, he could not rely on Murāri's account of Caitanya's later life, is conjectural. A critical study of Karṇapūra's Mahākāvya in comparison with his own drama and other subsequent biographies would reveal that the latter part of his Kāvya bears inaccurate information which he himself has corrected in his drama which is apparently written after his Kāvya, and that the present text of Murāri's account of later life records comparatively correct information. From all these we have every reason to infer that Karṇapūra described Caitanya's later life independently, not on the ground that he could not rely on Murāri's account but because the fourth Prakrama and a few cantos of third Prakrama were non-existent in Murāri's original text.

(4) Again, if we consider the question of Murāri's date, we shall see that the composition of this book by Murāri after the death of Caitanya seems improbable. We have no definite information that Murāri survived Caitanya. Even if we take it for granted that Murāri lived three or four years more after the death of Caitanya, he was too old to write this whole biography. Now let us consider the age of Murāri on the basis of the information received from subsequent biographers. Vṛndāvana-dāsa describes:

श्रीमुरारि गुप्त, श्रीकमलाकान्त नाम ।
कृष्णानन्द-आदि यत गोष्ठीर प्रधान ॥
सवारे चालये प्रभु फांकि जिज्ञासिया ।
शिशुज्ञाने केह किछु ना वोले हासिया ॥ (*C.bh.* i/8/38-39)

Locanadāsa also narrates:

शिशु शिशु खेलाखेलि, त्वरो हय गालागालि
धूला-रणे अङ्ग दिगवास ।
समान से वयःक्रम, सभे मेलि एक मर्म
घर्मविन्दु खेलार आयास ॥
सवे मेलि खेला खेले, गुप्त वेजा हेनकाले,
सेइ पथे आइला आचम्बित ।
तार येइ जन गण, सङ्गे करे गमन,
ज्ञानपथ विचरे पण्डित ॥
तार सङ्गे अनुमाने, योग तर्ज्जा वाखाने
कर शिर करिया चालन ।

देखे विश्वम्भर राय तार पाछे पाछे धाय,
अनुगत कृपार कारण ॥ (Ādi-khaṇḍa, p. 17/l. 1-6)

Again when Murāri fell at Viśvambhara's feet on that very day, having recognised the divinity of Caitanya, both Śacī Devī and Jagannātha Miśra told Murāri:

शची जगन्नाथ वोले, हाहा एइ कि करिले
तोरे देखि देवता समान ।
आशीर्वाद-योग्य तोर, ए अति वालक मोर,
कि करिले वड अविधान ॥
तोरे देखि शूद्रमुनि, जगजने वाखानि
वालके कि कैल अपराध ।
मो दिया ये हय हउ वाड़ुक शिशुर आउ
चिरजीवी देह आशीर्वाद ॥ (Ādi-khaṇḍa, p. 18/17-20)

From these passages we can infer that Murāri was fairly advanced in age and had acquired fame as a scholar when Caitanya was a mere child.

Mrinal Kanti Ghose states that Murāri was fifteen years old when Caitanya was born.[14] Though Ghose does not mention the source of his information, we have reasons to believe that Murāri was much older than Caitanya. From Vṛndāvanadāsa's *Caitanya-bhāgavata* we get the information that Murāri was born in Śrihaṭṭa (*C.bh.* 1/2/35) and from Jayānanda's *Caitanya-maṅgala* we know that Jagannātha Miśra's original home was at Śrihaṭṭa and that he came to Navadvīpa because of the out-break of famine, oppression of robbers and thieves and spread of epidemc diseases.[15] Possibly Murāri's parents also migrated to Navadvīpa at the same time and settled there. We also know that Jagannātha married Śacī Devī after he had settled down at Navadvīpa, and Caitanya was their tenth son. Thus, we can easily infer that when Caitanya was born, Murārī was a boy not less than fifteen years old. In Kavikarṇapūra's Kāvya also we get the information that Murāri was fairly old and infirm when he went to Nīlācala:

न पारयेऽहं व्रजितुं न शक्तिर्मम वर्तते (14/81)

In the light of these facts we can infer that if Murāri had survived Caitanya, he was possibly more than sixty-five years of age when Caitanya died. It seems unlikely that he undertook the responsibility of writing this

14 See preface to Murāri's *Śrī-kṛṣṇa-caitanya-caritāmṛtam* p. 1.

15 See Jayānanda's *Caitanya-maṅgala*, pp. 8-9. From Murāri's mentioning of Jagannātha Miśra's Vātsya gotra (1/3/20) we can infer that Jagannātha perhaps belonged to the famous Vaidic Brahmin group of Vātsya gotra of Śrihaṭṭa (Sylhet).

book at such an old age. Even if he had really accepted the responsibility, he would have possibly referred to his old age as Kṛṣṇadāsa-Kavirāja (*C.C.* 2/2/90-92) does. The present work does not appear to be the production of such a mature age. It seems quite probable that Śrīvāsa, who was an ardent devotee of Caitanya, was extremely shocked at Caitanya's embracing of Sannyāsa, and requested Murāri to write on the early life of Caitanya in order to perpetuate the memory of their loving Master whose early deification had by that time been almost established; and Murāri, who had a high regard and admiration for Caitanya, undertook the responsibility of describing Caitanya's early life at about Śaka 1433-34 and finished it in Śaka 1435.

(5) Again, the assumption of B. Majumdar that the verse which gives the date of composition was subsequently interpolated by some other devotee for the purpose of adding to the authenticity of the book can hardly be justified.[16] There is no reason why the devotee would add only the colophon and also specifically mention Śaka 1435, and the particular day namely, *āsāḍha-sitasaptamyām* and not any other date? It would also be unjustifiable to infer that the person who could compose such a Sanskrit verse had not the common sense to realise that if this premature colophon were added the genuineness of the book itself would be questioned.

Now, we may consider several peculiarities of the book which lead one to draw the inference of the hand of a second author in *Kṛṣṇa-caitanya-caritāmṛta* ascribed to Murāri Gupta.

(a) If we carefully study the book we shall see that the fourth Prakrama of Murāri's Kāvya was written by some other devotee who was a worshipper of Kṛṣṇa and who believed in Caitanya as the incarnation of Dvi-bhuja Kṛṣṇa,—a creed which subsequent biographers accepted. But in the earlier part of the text, Murāri describes Caitanya as the incarnation of four-armed Viṣṇu.

नमामि चैतन्यमजं पुरातनं चतुर्भुजं शंख-गजाब्ज-चक्रिणम् ।
श्रीवत्स-लक्ष्याङ्कित-वक्षसं हरिं सद्धाल संलग्न-मणिं सुवाससम् । (i/1/14).

But curiously enough in the fourth Prakrama Caitanya is described as

वृन्दारण्य-विलासिनो मुररिपोः श्रीरासलीलां शुभां
साक्षादेव विलास-लास्य-लहरी-पुर्णां मनन् श्रीहरिः ।
श्रीराधा-रस-माधुरी-धृतितनुर्गौराङ्ग-मूर्त्तिः स्वयम्
श्रीनन्दात्मज एव भक्ति-रसिकः स्वाराज्य-लक्ष्मीं दधे ॥ (iv/20/19).

16 See, B. Majumdar, *op. cit.*, p. 77.

Again, यशोदा-नन्दनः कृष्णः श्रीगोपीप्राणवल्लभः ।
श्रीराधारमणो रामानुजो रासरसोत्सुकः ॥ (iv/24/30).

That Murāri, who was professedly a Rāma worshipper and who had not even for once described with emotional exhuberence the Rādhā-Kṛṣṇa legend in the first three Prakramas, would, inspite of relevancy, devote eleven cantos (iv/2-12) to the descriptions of Gopa-Kṛṣṇa legend and the beatific sports of Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa seems strange and unconvincing.

(b) This inference is all the more strengthened by the frequent use of the term 'Kṛṣṇa' to identify Caitanya in the fourth Prakrama and in the last two cantos of the third Prakrama (iii. 17/16; 18/1, 12, 15, 23; iv. 1/10, 16, 13/11. 12. 22. 15/16, 19, 20/1, 21/1. 6. 22/8) in place 'of 'Hari' which is so frequently used in the first three Prakramas. Secondly, in the fourth Prakrama, Caitanya is, always mentioned as 'Śrīkṛṣṇa-Caitanya' and never as only 'Caitanya' (iv. 12/13, 15/1. 10, 17/4. 23, 19/14, 22/20, 23/12. 18. 23, 26/17. 24), but on the other hand, 'Śrī-Kṛṣṇa-Caitanya' occurs only twice in the first three Prakramas (ii. 14/25; iii. 14/15). Thirdly, the term 'Hari-Saṃkīrtana' which occurs so frequently in the first three Prakramas, occurs only thrice in the fourth Prakrama (iv. 1/19, 15/11, 18/20) and has been replaced by 'Kṛṣṇa-Kīrtana' or 'Kṛṣṇa-Saṃkīrtana' (iv. 1/1/1, 10/10 14/9. 15/11, 16/20, 18/23, 19/21, 23/24, 24/14. 29); 'Kṛṣṇa-Kīrtana' or 'Kṛṣṇa-Saṃkīrtana' occurs only four times upto the 16th canto of the third Prakrama (ii. 3/26, 17/19; iii. 7/21, 15/21).

(c) The term 'Gaurāṅga' to identify 'Caitanya' occurs only thrice in the first three Prakramas (i. 4/15, ii. 4/18, iii. 3/14), but it is used no less than thirty-one times in the fourth Prakrama (iv. 1/3. 5. 7, 8/10. 9/12, 10/9. 11/25, 14/6. 9, 16/10, 17/1. 22, 18/6. 20. 23. 19/15. 18. 20. 25. 26, 22/14. 15. 25, 23/15. 25, 24/1, 25/2, 26/13. 14. 16. 19. 25).

(d) If we critically study the fourth Prakrama we shall see that the poet concerned had a tendency to alliteration which is almost absent in the first three Prakramas. Here are a few instances:

(1) सुरम्य-सखी-चातुरी-चरित-चारु-वंशीस्वनैः
रासेश्वरी-रासेश्वरौ रस-विशेषपालोत्सुकौ (iv/10/22).

(2) श्रीराधा-रसमाधुरी-धुरि-तनुर्गौराङ्गमूर्तिः स्वयम् (iv/20/19).

(3) वेत्र-वंशी-श्रृङ्ग-वेणु-गुञ्जमाला-विभूषितैः (iv/23/24).

(4) श्रीराधारमणो रामानुजो रासरसोत्सुकः (iv/24/30).

(e) The vivid and picturesque description of Caitanya's emotional ecstasy is frequently given in the second and third Prakramas, but curiously

enough there is hardly any vivid description of Caitanya's mystic emotion, which became a constant feature of Caitanya's later life, in the whole fourth Prakrama of twenty-six cantos. The occasional short description of such state in the fourth Prakrama is so flat and unpoetic in comparison with those in the first three Praktramas that it seems that the latter portion comes from an inferior hand. A few passages are given below for comparison:

(1) मत्त-हुङ्कार-निर्घोषो मत्तद्विरदविक्रमः ।
नृत्यति धावति रौति क्षितौ विलुठति क्वचित् ॥ (iv/1/13).

(2) 'श्रुत्वा कृष्णरसोल्लासं बालकस्यैव वैभवम् ।
गौर-कृष्णः कृष्णदासं प्रेम्णालिङ्गितवान् स्वयम् ॥ (iv/6/19).

(3) श्रुत्वा रासविलास-वैभवरसं श्रीगौरचन्द्रो हरिः
प्रेमोन्माद-विभिन्नधैर्य-निवहो माधुर्यसारोज्ज्वलः ।
राधाकृष्णं व्रजवधूगणैर्वेष्टितं संविभाव्य
प्राकट्यं तत् स्वात्मनि तयोर्दर्शयन् संबभौ स्म ॥ (iv/9/20).

(4) श्रीराधिकाप्रेमभरातिमत्तो
हसन् रुदन् प्राह त्वमेव नाथ ।
आगच्छ यामि व्रजमण्डलं विभो
वृन्दावनं यत्र सुवंशिकाध्वनिः । (iv /20/14).

But in the second and third Prakramas we have more picturesque descriptions of Caitanya's religious emotion:

(1) क्वचिच्छ्रुत्वा हरेर्नाम गीतं वा विह्वलः क्षितौ ।
पतति श्रुतिमालेण दण्डवत् कम्पते क्वचित् ॥
क्वचिद् गायति गोविन्द कृष्ण कृष्णेति सादरम्
सन्नकण्ठः क्वचित् कम्प-रोमाञ्चित-तनुर्भृशम् ॥ (ii/1/25-26).

(2) विप्लुताक्षः क्वचित् कम्प-पुलकाञ्चितविग्रहः ।
विह्वलः स्खलितः क्वापि क्वचिद् द्रुतगतिर्व्रजन् ॥
मत्तकरीन्द्रवत् क्वापि तेजसा ववृधे क्वचित् ।
क्वचिद् गायति गोविन्द कृष्ण कृष्णेति सादरम् ॥ (iii/3/4-5).

(3) गच्छन् क्वचिद् गायति कृष्णगीतं
क्वचिद् वदेदर्थमलब्धसंज्ञम् ।
क्वचिद् द्रुतं याति शनैः क्वचित् स्खलद्-
गतिः क्वचित् प्रेमविभिन्नधैर्यः ॥ (iii/5/2).

The description of the various places of Vṛndāvana and the amorous sports of Rādhā and Kṛṣṇa is a long and laborious production of a craftsman rather than the simple and vivid description of an unsophisticated poet. Though the first three Prakramas do not claim very high poetical merit, it

must be said, in all fairness, that they display, to a certain extent, genuine emotion and gracefulness.

(f) Another striking peculiarity of the fourth Prakrama lies in the use of metres. Some new long-syllabled metres, which are absent in the first three Prakramas, are introduced in the fourth Prakrama, namely, the Mandākrāntā is employed eight times [iv. 5/13, 10/23 (the first pāda is a Śārdūlavikrīḍita), 11/12 (the last line is an unidentified metre of 18 syllables), 12/19-20, 14/17 (the last pāda is a Śārdūlavikrīḍita), 16/14 (second pāda is Sragdharā) and 15 (last two pādas are of Sragdharā metre)]. The Śārdūlavikrīḍita is found six times [iv. 8/18, 9/20 (last two pādas are of unidentified metres), 14/6 (first pāda is a Sragdharā and the second is Mandākrāntā), 16/16. 20]. The Prīthvī is found five times (iv. 9/6-7. 19, 10/21-22). Again, the Vasantatilaka, which is employed no less than fifty times in the first three Prakaramas (i. 14/33; ii. 1/47, 3/27, 4/19, 7/10-18, 9/1-12, 16/23; iii. 1/1-10, 6/20-21, 11/17-22), occurs only once in the fourth Prakrama (iv. 10/6); and Drutavilambita, which occurs in as many as fifteen verses (i. 12/8-11, 14-16. 19; ii. 7/1-6, 18/33) in the earlier Prakramas, is absent in the fourth Prakrama.

Thus, we have clear evidence of the association of a second author. We have little doubt that the entire fourth Prakrama and a few cantos of the third Prakrama were not written by Murāri. The presence of an anonymous hand is also evident in the portion which deals with the early history of Caitanya's life. As for instance, we may cite the last few verses of the 16th canto of the first Prakrama (1/16/15-19) which give in outline the history of Caitanya's later life. Murāri, who recorded only the early life of Caitanya, did not certainly outline a sketch of the later life of Caitanya. Thus, when we have reasons to believe that the entire fourth Prakrama and a few cantos of the third Prakrama were written by some person other than Murāri, and that even the portion which can exclusively be ascribed to Murāri was revised by the second author, then it would not be highly unjustifiable to infer that the verse which refers to Caitanya's death was added later on by the second author at the time of completing the unfinished Kāvya of Murāri.

There is no reason to doubt the genuineness of the colophon verse which gives its date of composition. It was perhaps inserted somewhere before the seventeenth canto of the third Prakrama but was retained even after the supplementary portions had been added.

BISWARANJAN BHADURI

British Policy Towards the Afghan War of Succession (1863-1868)*

II. Revolt of Afzal Khan (May-November, 1864).

In the last issue of this journal we have narrated the circumstances leading to the revolt of Muhammad Afzal Khan against his younger brother, Sher Ali, who succeeded Dost Muhammad in June, 1863. After the dispersal of Muhammad Azim Khan's troops in May, 1864, Sher Ali proceeded towards Bamian (where his eldest son, Muhammad Ali Khan, was encamped) to take command in person of the campaign in Turkistan.[1] Afzal Khan at once caused himself to be proclaimed Amir. The *Khutba* was read in his name, and coins were issued. He distributed six month's pay to all the troops and began to march on May 11 at the head of 25,000 troops and 32 guns.[2] In the meantime Azim Khan was compelled by the Amir's troops to leave Khost. He was sent by the Commissioner of Peshawar to Rawalpindi 'to prevent his creating disturbances on the border'.[3]

On June 3 Muhammad Ali Khan won a victory over Afzal Khan's troops[4] at Bajgah. The prince reported, "The leaders of four regiments of infantry and two regiments of cavalry, with five guns and some magazine stores, fell into my hands. Six regiments and most of the chiefs have tendered submission, and I expect that the remainder will gradually come in". Afzal Khan fled with the remnant of his force, but Muhammad Ali could not ascertain where he had gone.[5] It soon appeared, however, that this victory was not so decisive as the Amir's friends believed. The British Agent reported, "It is universally stated that Afzal Khan has ... strengthened his position ... and is quite ready for a second fight. The action is said to have been unusually fierce, and great gallantry to have been displayed on both sides. It is a day which will be notorious in Afghan history".[6]

* Continued from vol. XX, p. 20.

1 Foreign Department Proceedings, Political A Branch, Imperial Record Department, June, 1864, No. 41.

2 *P. P.(A)*, June, 1864, No. 46.

3 *Ibid.*, July, 1864, No. 24.

4 Afzal Khan himself was not present in the field.

5 *P. P.(A)*, July, 1864, No. 24.

6 *Ibid.*, No. 25.

After the battle of Bajgah the Amir went hastily to join the army in person.[7] Attempts were made by some intermediaries to bring about a settlement, "neither party feeling himself superior in power to the other".[8] Afzal Khan demanded that he should 'retain Balkh and its dependencies without payment of tribute', that Azim Khan should receive Khoorum, and that Jalalabad and Ghazni should be given to his friends. Naturally the Amir rejected these demands.[9]

These abortive negotiations were followed by the advance of the Amir's troops to Rooee, where Afzal Khan's force was encamped. Afzal Khan had chosen this position because it was situated in a large plain; his Uzbeg cavalry would be better able to operate there than in the defiles of the hilly tract.[10] The Amir personally proceeded to Rooee on June 17 on receipt of a confidential message from the heir-apparent.[11] Afzal Khan refused to attack the Amir's troops—"the patrols and pickets of the two armies sighted each other from a distance"—before the Amir's arrival on the spot. He wanted to 'try his fortune in one great action'. The Sultan of Bokhara 'sent pressing offers to the Sirdar of assistance both in men and money', but Afzal Khan 'replied that he stood in no present need of assistance, but would not fail to seek it when it was required'.[12]

Towards the close of June[13] a battle was fought near Dasht Soofaid, in which the Amir's troops were 'completely victorious'.[14] Some influential Sirdars again tried to bring about a settlement. A meeting of the rival brothers was brought about through their good offices. On June 29 Afzal Khan arrived at the Amir's camp and was received with great honour.[15] "Nothing can be more friendly than the bearing of the Amir and the Sirdar towards each other", reported the British Agent on July 14. The Amir released all prisoners taken at Bajgah and even bestowed robes of honour upon prisoners of rank. Afzal Khan furnished supplies in abundance to the Amir's troops and proved the intensity of his new-born loyalty by vili-

7 *P. P.(A)*, July, 1864, No. 25.
8 *Ibid.*, No. 26.
9 *Ibid.*, No. 27.
10 *Ibid.*, No. 27.
11 *Ibid.*, No. 28.
12 *Ibid.*, No. 29.
13 The date cannot be precisely determined from the documents.
14 *P. P.(A)*, July, 1864, No. 56. No reference is made to this battle in the Amir's letter to the Commissioner of Peshawar, dated July 3, 1864. *Ibid.*, August, 1864, No. 40.
15 *P. P.(A)*, August, 1864, Nos. 18, 31, 39.

fying Azim Khan. The two brothers proceeded together towards Turkistan 'for the purpose of arranging the affairs of that province'.[16]

But the harmony between the brothers, if it was ever sincere, was very short-lived. On July 21 the British Agent reported, "No further settlement has been made between the Amir and Sirdar Afzal Khan. Ostensibly their bearing continues unchanged, profuse kindness on one side and profession of obedience on the other, but no one, great or small, belonging to the Kabul party is allowed to go near the Sirdar without the Amir's permission".[17] It was later on discovered that Afzal Khan had been placed under arrest as early as July 14. Some Sirdars who enjoyed the confidence of the Amir, including Sirdar Muhammad Rafik Khan, suggested that Afzal Khan should be removed from Turkistan and appointed Governor of Khurum, Ghazni or Jalalabad, and that he should not be allowed to keep under his control more than 6,000 troops. The Amir 'entirely concurred' with this proposal, but Afzal Khan 'was taken quite aback, and positively declined to consent to the arrangement'. He 'hotly' told the Amir, "I came to you on the strength of your promise on the Koran. I now desire that, in accordance with that promise ratified by your seal and the holy book, you will leave me master of my own actions". Six guards were at once placed round his tent.[18]

It was now necessary for the Amir to get hold of Afzal Khan's eldest son and principal assistant, Sirdar Abdur Rahman Khan, who was at that time in Turkistan at the head of his father's troops. The Amir asked Afzal Khan to summon his son to the camp, but 'the Sirdar declined to interfere and replied that his son was at liberty to act as he pleased in the matter'. Abdur Rahman took measures to strengthen himself as soon as he heard of his father's confinement. The Amir's advisers fondly imagined that Afzal Khan was unpopular in Turkistan and that "they would experience but little difficulty in gaining complete possession of its provinces". Abdur Rahman's refusal to come to the Amir's camp and the loyalty of '10 or 12,000 good and faithful troops' under his command upset their plan.[19] The Amir now thought it necessary to restore Turkistan to Afzal Khan, except the provinces of Meimenah and Kunduz-Khanabad-Salikan-Badakshan, which were to be governed from Herat and Kabul respectively.[20] This arrangement was ac-

16 *P. P.(A)*, August, 1864, No. 40.
17 *Ibid.*, No. 41.
18 *Ibid.*, No. 43.
19 *Ibid.*, October, 1864, No. 1.
20 *Ibid.*, Nos. 3, 5.

cepted by Afzal Khan, but "his son on various pretexts avoided coming to pay his respects" to the Amir.[21] At last, on August 18, Abdur Rahman visited the Amir at Mazar Sharif and later on joined his father, who had been released from confinement, at Tukhtapool.[22]

On August 24 Afzal Khan was suddenly placed under confinement in the citadel of Tashkurghan. The Governor of Kabul told the British Agent that "the intrigues of the Sirdar's son, which were not checked by the Sirdar himself, had necessitated the measure". Abdur Rahman Khan was directed by the Amir to 'give up all his proud schemes and proceed at once with his family and all his property to Kabul'. Abdur Rahman 'fled with a few followers, but it was not known where he had gone'. In impotent wrath the Amir "called Sirdar Muhammad Usman Khan and in public durbar gave him a pair of leg irons and desired him to go and put them on the captive (Afzal Khan). Sirdar Muhammad Usman Khan pointed out that this was quite contrary to the customs of the Barakzai family, and that, if the Amir really wanted the order to be carried out, he begged that he might be excused from the duty. The Amir turned from him in great wrath and desired General Sheik Mir to do it. The General took the irons and, placing them before Sirdar Muhammad Afzal Khan, informed him of the order. The old chief said, 'It is God's will', and spitting three times on his own beard, stretched out his legs, when the General affixed the irons and left him".[23] Sirdar Sultan Ali Khan, who had induced Afzal Khan to come to the Amir's camp after the battle of Bajgah, "represented to his Highness that the Sirdar had given himself up on the Amir's recorded oath and on his personal assurances; that, as these had been broken by the unheard of proceedings adopted, he felt disgraced and requested a passport to proceed to Mecca. No answer was given him". Afzal Khan's property, amounting to about a crore of rupees, was confiscated and his family was confined in Kabul.[24]

These atrocities, the Commissioner of Peshawar observed, "turned the sympathies of most of the Sirdars and chiefs in favour of Afzal Khan and destroyed their confidence in the Amir, whose temper has become so irri-

21 *P. P.(A)*, August, 1864, No. 7.

22 *Ibid.*, No. 8.

23 The irons were later on removed, and Afzal Khan was confined in the Bala Hissar at Kabul, in the old *Dewankhana* near the female apartments. *Ibid.*, November, 1864, No. 28; December, 1864, No. 135.

24 *Ibid.*, October, 1864, Nos. 10, 11.

table and violent that nobody dares to counsel him except five persons[25] who see their own advancement in the ruin of others". The British Agent reported, "Thoughtful people assert that half the army and half the strength of the Kabul Government may have been lost and the other half is destitute of the discipline and order which existed in the time of the late Amir".[26]

We have already referred to Abdur Rahman's sudden flight from Takhtapool. It was soon ascertained that his destination was Bokhara. The Sultan of Bokhara had been always friendly to Afzal Khan, for the latter had given him valuable assistance at the time of his expedition against Kohat and Hissar.[27] An envoy despatched to the Amir by the Sultan accidentally arrived at Takhtapool soon after Afzal Khan's imprisonment and at once returned to Bokhara.[28] Some influential Sirdars openly espoused the rebel's cause and fled across the Oxus into Bokhara.[29] The Uzbegs attacked the Afghans settled in the Takhtapool district and "according to their customs, carried off about a thousand families, with their wives, children and property, across the border". The Amir took no step to put down these disorders.[30] He merely sent a trustworthy messenger with a letter to the Sultan of Bokhara regarding Abdur Rahman.[31] No reply was received, but it was reported towards the close of September that Abdur Rahman had been received with great distinction by the Sultan of Bokhara.[32]

Unable to dislodge his rebel nephew from Bokhara, the Amir advanced towards Kabul in October. It was necessary to deal with Amin Khan at once. He was determined 'never to relinquish his hold over Kandahar'. Muhammad Sharif Khan left Kabul and joined his brother at Kandahar.[33] On hearing this the Amir at once sent the heir-apparent, Muhammad Ali Khan, with a body of horse to Kabul by the Hindu Kush road.[34] While on his way towards Kabul the Amir heard that presents to the value of 1½ lakhs of rupees sent by the Russian Government to the Sultan of Bokhara had been bestowed by the Sultan on Abdur Rahman, to whom a residence had been assigned in the Royal Garden, and that orders had been

25 One of them was Sirdar Muhammad Rafik Khan.
26 *P. P.(A)*, October, 1864, No. 12.
27 *Ibid.*, July, 1864, No. 29.
28 *Ibid.*, October, 1864, No. 11.
29 *Ibid.*, Nos. 11, 12.
30 *Ibid.*, No. 12.
31 *Ibid.*, November, 1864 No. 27.
32 *Ibid.*, No. 28.
33 *Ibid.*, Nos. 28, 70.
34 *Ibid.*, No. 197.

issued by the Sultan to collect boats for the passage of the Oxus. This news was followed by the report that the Sultan had no designs on Balkh.[35]

As the Amir proceeded towards the capital, various plans, some of them suggested by interested sycophants, entered his head. He hesitated to strike openly at Amin Khan. If Amin Khan escaped towards Shikarpur and took refuge with the British Government as Azim Khan had done, would not he 'endeavour to disparage and injure' the Amir?[36] On one occasion he proposed to 'place under restraint' some Sirdars whom he regarded as 'dangerous to the State'. Fortunately Sirdar Muhammad Rafik Khan convinced him that "it was impolitic to create new causes of apprehension at a time already troublous'.[37]

The Amir entered Kabul on November 14, and decided that no expedition should be sent against Kandahar during the winter. The horses and cattle were in a bad condition from their recent journey. A far more important factor was that the army had not received its pay for the last ten months. It was also reported about the same time that the Sultan of Bokhara had secured from the *Ulema* in his kingdom a *fatwa* of infidelity against the Amir, who had violated his solemn promise made on the Quran by imprisoning Afzal Khan. The Sultan openly promised military assistance to Abdur Rahman. This intelligence naturally disquieted the Amir and probably strengthened his resolution not to attack Kandahar at once.[38]

At this crisis the intervention of Russia saved the Amir. The Russians were not prepared to alienate the Amir's sympathy. So they put pressure on the Sultan of Bokhara and compelled him to 'withdraw his favour and support' from Abdur Rahman.[39] Abdur Rahman now wanted to retire to Mecca. The Sultan of Bokhara at first replied that he was free to go to any country except Russia, but afterwards a message from Afzal Khan[40] changed his mind. He said to Abdur Rahman, "Your father has entrusted you to the State. It is proper, therefore, that you should continue here."[41] Abdur Rahman wisely listened to this advice and remained at Bokhara.

35 *P. P.(A)*, Nov., 1864, No. 244.
36 *Ibid.*, No. 245.
37 *Ibid.*, No. 264.
38 *Ibid.*, December, 1864, No. 135, 136.
39 *Ibid.*, No. 137.
40 This shows that Afzal Khan kept himself in touch with his son.
41 *Ibid.*, No. 201.

III. Revolt of Abdur Rahman Khan (August, 1865—May, 1866).

Sher Ali now found himself in a strong position; once again his tyrannical nature triumphed over his habitual weakness. He proposed to put out the eyes of Afzal Khan, but he was warned against such a course by his confidential advisers including the heir-apparent, who observed that "since the rise of the Barakzais to the throne such a thing had never been done by any member of the family".[42]

Meanwhile Abdur Rahman had been trying to secure active assistance from the Sultan of Bokhara. In May, 1865, the Sultan 'called a council of chiefs and asked them what could be done for Sirdar Abdur Rahman Khan in return for the services rendered to the state of Bokhara by his father'. The Chiefs replied 'that in the present disturbed state of Turkistan a mere demonstration on the part of the king would prove of material assistance to the Sirdar'. The Sultan 'directed all his chiefs to prepare a long march; he also sent word to Sirdar Abdur Rahman Khan'.[43] After some time Abdur Rahman encamped at Sherabad 'with many followers from Bokhara'.[44] He advanced to Tukhtapool in August, 1865, and prepared to march towards Kabul. "The *Khutbah* has been read in the name of the King of Bokhara", reported the British Agent from Kabul.[45] Afzal Khan's partisans became busy at Kabul 'in intriguing with the officers of the army to gain them to their interests'.[46]

Instead of taking energetic measures to resist the impending attack, Sher Ali gave way to gloomy despair. In September, 1865, he declared 'that his heart prompted him to relinquish the worldly cares of the State, and that it seemed right to atone for his breach of faith to Afzal Khan, that the kingdom should be made over to that Sirdar'.[47] One of his trusted ministers told the British Agent that 'the Amir's mind is so affected that he cannot bring his thoughts to bear on the affairs of the State, and that ......it is impossible for the present Government to last'.[48]

Early in December, 1865, Abdur Rahman advanced as far as the Ghorbund district, within '25 or 28 *coss* north-west from Kabul'. Negotia-

42 *P.P.(A)*, May, 1865. No. 133.

43 *Ibid.*, June, 1865, No. 120.

44 *Ibid.*, August, 1865, Nos. 37, 94.

45 *Ibid.*, September, 1865, Nos. 17, 78, 116; October. 1865, No. 49.

46 *Ibid.*, October, 1865, No. 95.

47 *Ibid.*

48 *Ibid.*, No. 115.

tions were opened, and towards the close of December peace was concluded on the following terms: Afzal Khan was to be released, Sher Ali was to remain the head of the State, and appanages were to be assigned to 'the other Sirdars' according to the arrangements of the late Amir.[49] "The Amir's mind", reported the Kabul *Munshi,* "is affected. He has not held Durbar for a long time, three or four men only are in attendance, His Highness never leaves the private apartments. He sometimes says, 'Raise a regiment of cavalry and kill every man in Kandahar and Kabul'; sometimes he expresses a wish to visit England, or Russia, and sometimes declares he will repair to Mecca".[50]

Sir John Lawrence remained a silent, if not indifferent, spectator while the Kabul monarchy was on the brink of dissolution. On June 5, 1865, he wrote to Sher Ali, "It is with great regret that I have learnt of the divisions unhappily existing in your Highness's family, but I trust that the Ruler of all things will so order the course of events that a compromise may be effected among your Highness's relations......"[51] A few months later, however, he made it clear that he was not prepared to dislodge Dost Muhammad's family from Afghanistan. In January, 1866, Shahpur and Muhammad Nadir, sons of ex-Amir Shah Shuja, wrote to the Governor-General, "......we live here in the hope that an opportunity may offer itself when we, with the aid of the British Government, may avenge the murder of our father and friends". They received a curt reply: "......no attempt on Kabul on the part of the Shahzadah will be countenanced by the British Government".[52]

After the conclusion of the treaty referred to above, Sirdar Muhammad Azim Khan, who was then in league with Afzal Khan, made himself the *de facto* ruler of Kabul (early part of the year 1866). The Government of India wrote to the Punjab Government:

"The Ameer himself has shown that he in many respects possesses the qualities of a ruler, but he has also considerable defects......Still Afghan Chiefs are not to be judged by the principles of Christendom, nor can we be sure that the nobles and people may not again rally round the Ameer if he shows resolution and vigour......sound policy dictates that we should

49 *P. P.(A)*, January, 1866, Nos. 51, 139.

50 *Ibid.*, No. 182.

51 *Ibid.*, June 1865, No. 25.

52 *Ibid.*, February, 1866. Nos. 162, 163.

not be hasty in giving up the Ameer's cause as lost. We should await the development of events and for the present continue to recognise Sher Ali as the Ameer of Afghanistan. If the Ameer fail in his attempt to recover Cabul and Sirdar Mahomed Azim Khan establish his power and make overtures to the British Government, the latter can then be recognised as the ruler of such parts of the country as he may possess. It should be our policy to show clearly that we will not interfere in the struggle, that we will not aid either party, that we will leave the Afghans to settle their own quarrels, and that we are willing to be on terms of amity and good will with the nation, and with their rulers *de facto*".[53]

The terms of the treaty were not fulfilled; so Abdur Rahman sought for Azim Khan's assistance for continuing hostilities against Sher Ali.[54] Their combined forces besieged Ghazni (April, 1866).[55] Sher Ali was defeated in May, 1866. He fled; Afzal Khan was set free.[56] On May 21, 1866, the British Agent at Kabul reported, "The authorities of Cabul salute Sardar Mahomed Afzal Khan by the title of Ameer......"[57]

IV. Rule of Afzal Khan and Azim Khan (May, 1866—August, 1868).

Once more Sher Ali adopted a manly attitude and tried to recover his throne with British assistance, but Sir John Lawrence gave him no help.[58] Afzal Khan's rule became very unpopular due to the imposition of 'a new and heavy-pressing assessment'. He offended the priests by interfering with their allowances, and they issued a *fatwa*, declaring that obedience to him was unlawful.[59] Sher Ali took advantage of this discontent against his enemies and collected troops. In November, 1866, Afzal Khan offered him the provinces of Kabul and Turkistan, retaining Kandahar and Herat for himself.[60] Sher Ali refused this offer and marched for Kabul in December.[61] His progress was, however, temporarily stopped by the defeat and death of his principal ally, Faiz Muhammad Khan. Afzal Khan died in November, 1867, and Azim Khan succeeded him at Kabul 'with the consent of the son of the late Ameer, Sirdar Abdur Rahman Khan, and the

53 *P. P.(A)*, April, 1866, No. 195.
54 *Ibid.*, No. 205.
55 *Ibid.*, Nos. 205. 210; May, 1866, No. 90.
56 *Ibid.*, May, 1866. No. 171.
57 *Ibid.*, June, 1866. No. 107.
58 *Ibid.*, August, 1866, No. 38; September, 1866, No. 29A.
59 *Ibid.*, September, 1866, No. 77.
60 *Ibid.*, December, 1866, No. 2.
61 *Ibid.*, No. 169.

approval of the chiefs and 'people of the country'.[62] Sher Ali occupied Kabul in August, 1868.[63] On September 10, 1868, the Governor-General sent the following telegram to the Secretary of State: "Ameer Sher has recovered Cabul. Now would be the time to help him with effect, if it is to be done at all......On his application we would send him six lakhs of rupees and, say, 3,000 common muskets."[64] Well might Sher Ali declare: "The English look to nothing but their own interests and bide their time; whosesoever side they see stronger for the time, they turn to him as their friends."[65]

ANILCHANDRA BANERJEE

62 *P. P.JA1*, November, 1867, No. 126, 129.
63 *Ibid.*, August, 1868, No. 144; September, 1868, No. 7.
64 *Ibid.*, September, 1868, No. 191.
65 Letter to Yaqub Khan.

Rastrakuṭas of Kanyakubja and their Migration to Marwar

There are conflicting theories regarding the origin of the Rāṭhors. The present ruling dynasties of Jodhpur and Bikaner claim descent from the Rāṣṭrakūṭas of Kānyakubja or Kanauj.[1] Tradition has it that after the final overthrow of Jayacandra, by the invading arms of Shāhb-ud-din Ghori in 1194 A.D., a handful of the survivors, unwilling to submit to the conqueror, sallied forth under the leadership of Rao Sihāji, said to be a grandson[2] of Jayacandra, to carve their fortune in the 'scrub and desert of Rajputana.'

In view of the above theory some modern scholars[3] have come to the conclusion that Gaharwārs, when they migrated to Rajputana became known as Rāṭhors, as it is beyond doubt that Jayacandra was a 'Gāhaḍavāla; while some others[4] hold that some section among the Gāhaḍavālas was already known as 'Rāṭhor' or 'Rāstrakūṭa' and Jayacandra belong to that section of the Gāhaḍavālas.

Another school of modern historians think that there were no Rāṭhor rulers over Kanauj during the time, so the traditional 'Kanaujiā Rāṭhodā' is a myth. They suppose that the modern Rāthors, therefore, must be the descendants of some foreign tribes, probably Scythic,[5] who had no connection, whatsoever, with Kanauj.

There is yet a third theory propounded by Sir Wolseley Haig,[6] who denies the whole story of this migration and holds that, 'the Gaharwār line was certainly extinguished, and there is no reason to believe that the Gaharwārs were Rāṣṭrakūṭas, and an inscription dated 997 A.D.,[7] found in a town

1 Tod, *Annals and Anti. of Raj.*, Ed. By Crooke, vol. I, p. 161; vol. II, p. 824.

2 Bikaner Praśasti of Rai Singhji, the fort Bikaner. Ed. in *JASB.*, vol. XVI (New Series) pp. 262 f.; Tri Singhari Inscription of Duhada V.S. 1366. All the bardic chronicles are unanimous in support of the tradition.

3 Smith, *Early Hist. of India,* 4th Ed., p. 399 fn. 5.

4 Pt. Ram Karan, *Sir Asutosh Mukerjee, Silver Jubilee vol.* Orientals Pt. II, pp. 259-61, Pt. Biseshwar Nath Reu. *JRAS.*, Jan. 1930, pp. 111-121, C. V. Vaidya, *Hist. of M. H. Ind.*, vol. III, pp. 217-21 etc.

5 Tod, *Annals & Anti. of Raj.*, vol. I, p. 161, fn. 2.

6 *Cambridge Hist. of India,* vol. III, p. 521.

7 The Hastikundi inscription of Dhawal, *EI.*, vol. X. pp. 17-24, *Imp. Gazetteer of India,* VI, p. 247.

in Jodhpur State, names four Rāṣṭrakūṭa Rājas, who reigned there in the 10th century." Sir W. Haig concludes, therefore, that, "it was probably from these local chieftains that Sihāji was descended."

Since some of the above mentioned historians propounded the above theories, fresh evidence on the subject have come to light in the form of notable inscriptions, which beyond doubts establish the fact that the Rāṣṭrakūṭas did rule over Kanauj from 1050-1200 A.D.[8] and the Rāṣṭrakūṭas and Rāṭhors are one and the same, the tradition in Rajputana regarding the descent of the modern Rāṭhors from the Rāṭhors of Kanauj is, therefore, not without foundation.

There are clear indications that the Rāṣṭrakūṭas were settled in the United Provinces and Rajputana prior to the rise of the Gāhaḍavālas. A passage in the Surat grant of Trilocanapāla dated 1151 A.D. bears testimony to their earliest connections with Kanauj, when it says: 'O thou Cālukya, king of kings marrying the princess of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas in Kānyakubja bless thou (the world) with offspring obtained from her."[9]

The Jhānsi stone-inscription[10] of Sallaksan (Simhā) (?) which for palæographic reasons may be placed in the 11th or 12th century A.D., speaks in the very opening lines of the river of the gods, the Ganges, as the resting place of Kānyakubja. From this it is inferred that this record has reference to the rulers of Kānyakubja themselves and seems to provide the genealogy of a certain family of chiefs who owed allegiance to them. In the 20th line we are told that somebody protected Kīrtivarman (the Candella king of Kālañjir) against the Cedi king Karan and that he defeated the armies of Karan and himself replaced Kīrtivarman on the throne. It also hints as if this ruler of Kānyakubja along with Kīrtivarman and Udayāditya of Mālwā made a confederacy against the mighty Karan, whom he conquered like 'Murāri' Himself.[11] The inscription is so fragmentary that nothing more can be

8 H. C. Ray, *Dynastic Hist. of N. India*, vol. I, p. 566.

9 *IA*., vol. XII, pp. 201-3. Verse 6. Cf.

कान्यकुब्जे महाराज राष्ट्रकूटस्य कन्याम् लब्धा ।
सुखाय तस्याम् त्वं चालुक्यापनही संततीम् ॥

Dr. Hoernle saw 'no historical value' in this statement and tried to interpret the verse in a different way—See *JRAS*., 1905, pp. 10-11.

10 *EI*., vol. I, pp. 214-17.

11. ... ... तानि सैन्यान्यलं
जित्वा तस्य मुरारिणेव जयिना स्थान्मोद हारि स्वयम् ॥

said about this prince of Kānyakubja than that he was a contemporary of Kirtīvarman and Udayāditya and that his reign can, therefore, approximately be placed between the years 1050 and 1090 A.D.

But more definite information about the local rulers of Kanauj and the area around it during this period is supplied by the Budāun Stone inscription of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa Lakhanapāla.[12] This record, proving beyond doubts the existence of the Rāṣṭrakūṭas in the vicinity of Kanauj, was found in Aug: 1887 in the ruins of the South Gate of the old fort of Budāun, the chief town of the district of the same name in U.P. It contains 23 lines, written in Devanāgarī characters of about 12th or 13th century A.D. It probably contained a date in line 23, but unfortunately the editor could not read it. The genealogical portion tells us that the town of 'Vodāmyuta,[13] the ornament of the land of Pañcāla, was protected by the princes born in the Rāṣṭrakūṭa family (*Kula*). The inscription then gives the following list:

1. Candra
2. Vigrahapāla
3. Bhuvanapāla
4. Gopāla

5. Tribhuvana (Pāla) 6. Madanapāla 7. Devapāla

8. Bhīmapāla
9. Sūrapālā

10. Amṛtapāla 11. Lakhanapāla

(शौ) र्यं प्रपंचतनु ... ... ।
... ... ॥
कर्णो महीधरस्य सकलक्ष्मापाल चूडामणे ।
तस्माद्रक्षित कीर्तिवर्मा नृपतिं दत्वा स्वयं शासनम् ॥
क्षि .. .. कीर्तिवर्मा ।
राजानोऽमी तयोऽपि स्फुटबहुवसना यज्वने वाग्नयस्ते ॥

12 *EI*, vol. I, pp. 61-66—Edited by Kielhorn.

13 Identified by Kielhorn with Budaun called Vodāmyuta in the epigraph (lines 1 and 11).

It next proceeds to give the list of the spiritual predecessors of Śaiva ascetic Īśāna Śiva, who in the reign of Lakhanapāla, erected a Śaiva temple at Vodāmyuta. The inscription was composed by the poet Govindacandra.

This record bestows vague praise on most of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa princes with the exception of Madanapāla the 6th of the line. We are told about this ruler that in consequence of his distinguished prowess there never was any talk of the "Hamvīras" coming to the banks of the river of gods, (Ganges). The identification of this 'Hamvīra' with Yamini Sultan Masud III (*c.* 1099-1115 A.D.) is suggested by a Sahet Mahath Buddhist inscription dated 1119-20 A.D.[14] which mentions a 'Gādhipurādhipa Gopāla and his son Madana, who are quite likely to be identified with the Rāṣṭrakūṭa princes (4) and (6) in the Budāun record bearing the same names.[15] The date of Madanapāla, on the basis of Sahet Mahath inscription, can conveniently be placed in the first quarter of the 12th century, as he is reported living and opposing the 'Hamvīras' during this time.

The *Tabakāt-i-Nāsiri,*[16] mentions that in the reign of Masud III, the contemporary of the Gāhaḍavāla emperor Madana Candra (also known as Madanapāla), whose reign terminated sometime before 1114 A.D., "Hājib Tughātigin crossed the river Gang, in order to carry on a holy war in Hindustan, and penetrated to a place where except Sultan Mohamud, no one had reached so far with an army before." Some of the details of this campaign are perhaps recorded in a poem of Masud bin Sa'd ibn Salmān, who lived in the court of Masud III. Masud describes Kanauj as the capital of India, the *Ka'aba* of the Shamans and the *Kibla* of the Kafirs." We are told that all the treasures of India go to this city as smaller streams pour into a large river. It has armies, wealth, elephants and weapons. Its king was a powerful ruler, and as furious 'as a hyena.' But in spite of all his wealth and bravery he was defeated by Masud III and compelled to ransom his person by a large sum of money.[17]

14 First edited by Kielhorn in *IA.*, vol. XVII, pp. 61-64. The text was then published by A. Führer in *Archæological Survey of India*, vol. I. (N.S.) by Hoey in *JASB.*, vol. LXI, pt. I. Extra No. pp. 57-64. He reads the date as 1119-20 A.D. or 1176 V.S. See also N. B. Sanyal, *JASB.*, 1924, vol. XXI. (N.S.), p. 105.

15 *JASB.*, 1925, pp. 105 ff.

16 *T.N.*, edited by Raverty, vol. I, p. 107.

17 *Diwan-i-Salman*, ed. by Abdul Quāsim Akhvani, Teharān, Elliot, vol. IV, pp. 526-27. The name of the Kanauj ruler can also be written as Mulhi or Mulhirā.

It is, however, extremely difficult to identify this reigning prince of Kanauj whom the great poet designates as Melhi or Malhīrā. It seems possible that the text is here corrupt for Mānkīrā, a term applied by the Arabs to the Rāṣṭrakūṭa sovereigns of the Deccan as a result of a further corruption of their title 'Vallabha-rāja of Mālkhed' or 'Balhari of Mānkīrā,' as the Arabs designated them.[18] The name intended may have been, therefore, as H. C. Ray[19] also suggests that of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa Madanapāla, the local ruler of Kanauj, of whom the Budāun record mentions that during his reign there never was any talk of Hamvīras coming to the banks of the Ganges.[20]

In this struggle against the Turkish forces, this Rāṣṭrakūṭa chief of Kanauj was also aided by the then emperor Madanapāla Gāhaḍavāla, living at Kāśī. In the Rahan inscription[21] of his times, we are told that his son Govindacandra defeated the Muhammadans while still a prince. The Sarnāth inscription[22] of Kumāradevī contains the following verse about Govindacandra (1115-55) of Gāhaḍavāla dynasty of Kanauj and Benares.

'Hari (Viṣṇu) has been commissioned by Hara (Śiva) to protect Vārānasī (Benares) from the wicked Turuṣka fighter; Hari was born again from him (Madanapāla). The son was famous by the name of Govindacandra.'

These references of the 'Hammira or Hamvīra,' beyond doubts, relate to the same event of the reign of Masud III, whose Hajib, according to the Muslim chronicle, must have invaded the Ganges-Jumna valley in the 1st decade of the 12th century A.D. There seems little doubt that in these very conflicts with the Turkish king or his generals that prince Govindacandra distinguished himself, for whom it is said that the Muslim king (Masud III) is reported to have laid aside his enmity on seeing the display of the prince's matchless fighting. We can, therefore, believe that Madana-

18 Harvard Oriental Series, 1901, pp. 32, 240. *IA.*, vol. XII, p. 182, v. 10, *Bombay Gazetteer,* vol. I, pt. II, pp. 387-89.

19 H. C. Ray, *Dynastic Hist. of N. India,* vol. I, pp. 514-15.

20 यत्पौरुषात्प्रवरतः सुरसिन्धुतीरहम्वीरसंगमकथा न कदाचिदासीत् ।

21 *IA.*, vol. XVIII, pp. 14-19. हम्मीरं न्यस्तवैरं मुहुरसमरणक्रीडया या विधते । or 'Who again and again by the play of his matchless fighting makes the Hammira lay aside his enmity.'

22 *EI.*, vol. IX, p. 319.

वाराणसीभुवनरक्षक दक्ष एको दुष्टात्तुरुष्कसुभटादवितुं हरेण ।
उक्तो हरिस्स पुनरत्र बभूव तस्माद्गोविन्दचन्द्र इति प्रथिताभिधानः ॥

pāla Rāṣṭrakūṭa, having succeeded to the throne of Kanauj in the time of his namesake Madanapāla Gāhaḍavāla survived him and also remained contemporary of his son Govindacandra. The above statements about them in the epigraphs clearly imply that they successfully defended the Gangetic valley against the foreign invasions and during the rest of their reigns, we hear of no new invasion by the Turks from the North-West.

On these considerations it can be asserted with fair certainty, that during the 1st quarter of the 12th century Madanapāla Rāṣṭrakūṭa was ruling at Kanauj. As in the Sahet Mahath inscription he is not given the title 'Gādhipurādhipa,' we can infer that his brother, Tribhuvanapāla, must have lost his independence at the hands of Gāhaḍavāla Candradeva, who is said to have conquered Kānyakubja and established himself there about 1090 A.D. It is quite likely as scholars[23] believe that Madanapāla and his successors survived as the feudatories of the Gāhaḍavālas of Benares.[24]

The date of Gopāla as suggested by these two epigraphs is between 1050 and 1090 A.D. He thus becomes a contemporary of the Candella Kīrtivarman of Kālañjir and Udayāditya of Malwa. The Jhansi fragmentary stone-inscription, as has already been pointed out, says that some local ruler of Kānyakubja protected Kīrtivarman against Karan of Cedi (*c.* 1041-70) whom he defeated and thus revived once again the Candella power by 'himself' placing Kīrtivarman on the throne.

These very events, by a curious coincidence, are also related in the prologue of Krishna Miśra's *Prabodhacandrodaya*.[25] This drama was acted before Kīrtivarman at the command of his general and faithful 'Sāmanta' or feudal lord, a 'Rāja'[26] named Gopāla, who had just vanquished Karan and

23 H. C. Ray, *D.H.N.I.*, vol. I, p. 554, *IHQ.*, 1922, p. 91.

24 First suggested by Smith, *Oxford Hist. of India*, 1923, p. 195, H. C. Ray, *D.H.N.I.*, vol. I, p. 507.

Ferishta calls Jayacandra, the king of Kanauj & Benares. See T. F. Brigg's Trans. vol. I, p. 178, Elliot, vol. II, pp. 250 ff.

Tabakat-i-Nāsirī also refers to them as Rais of Benares and Kanauj. It is significant that a very large number of the Gāhaḍavālas' inscriptions have been discovered near Benares and these record grants of lands near that sacred city. The Candellas' Inscriptions also seem to refer to them as rulers of Kāśī.

25 The text has been printed at the Nirnaya Sagar Press, Bombay, being edited by Vasudeva Sharma. There is an imperfect translation by J. Taylor, London 1812.

26 Modern scholars e.g. Kielhorn and H. C. Ray, believe that this Gopāla was a Brahmin, perhaps on the basis of one passage in which the heroism and valour of Gopāla are compared to the merciless activities of 'Paraśurāma's famous battle-axe,

again placed Kīrtivarman on the throne. In view of these assertions it is quite certain that this Gopāla must have acted as a saviour of the fortune of the Candellas, when they were overwhelmed by the attacks of the Cedi King Karan, who must have kept in subjection for sometime, the Candella territory prior to his defeat at the hands of this powerful and loyal general. The mention of this saviour of Kīrtivarman in the Jhansi fragmentary inscription makes it almost decisive that this Gopāla must be a ruler of Kanauj, otherwise known as 'Gādhipura.' I therefore find no difficulty in maintaining that this Gopāla, can be none else but Gopāla, referred as 'Gādhipurādhipa' in the Sahet Mahath inscription and 'Rāṣṭrakūṭa' in the Budaun record, —a conclusion perfectly supported by chronological considerations.

Hence, it is not unlikely to infer, that Gopāla and his predecessors, prior to their defeat at the hands of the Gāhaḍavāla Candradeva, were the 'Sāmantas' or feudal lords of the Candellas of Kāliñjar, who practically were

sparing neither women, children nor old age. But for the following reasons he definitely was a Raja and a Kṣatriya:—

(i) All the appellations and figurative images and similies used for him are seen often qualifying the Kṣatriya princes in other earlier Sanskrit works: Compare:—

(a) आसीदशेषनरपतिशिरःसमभ्यर्चित शासनः......अविजिताशेषभुवनमण्डलतया of *Kādambari* (1st sentence) where the words are used for Raja क्षुद्रक, with सकलसामन्तचक्रचूडामणिमरीचिमंजरीनीराजितचरणकमलेन of *Prabodhacandrodaya.*

(b) नाम्नेव यो निर्भिन्नारातिहृदयो विरचितनारसिंहरूपाडम्बरम् (*Kādambari*— 1st. sentence.) and बलवदरिनिवहवक्षस्तटकपाटपाटनप्रकटितनृसिंहरूपेण (*Prabodhacandrodaya*).

(c) तेषां प्रतीपो राजाभूत् सर्बभूतहिते रतः (*Mahābhārata* for Rāja प्रतीप and भगवन्नारायणांशभूतो भूतहिताय (*Prabodhacandrodaya* for Gopāla).

(ii) Two very old Ms. 'Ṭikās or Commentaries consulted by Vasudeva Sharma, the modern editor of the Nirnaya Sagar Press edition definitely mention while explaining the speeches in the prologue about Gopāla, that he was a 'Rāja,' so consequently a 'Kṣatriya'.

(iii) The Jhansi Stone inscription also hints that this saviour of Kīrtivarman was a 'Rāja' of Kānyakubja.

(iv) Lastly, as he is compared with Man-lion incarnation (Narasiṃha) and with primeval Boar and Viṣṇu, and the terms प्रताप, पुरुषार्थ, असिलतामात्रमित्रेण, पौरुषभूषणा पुरुषाः, भगवन्नारायणांशभूता भूतहिताय etc. generally used for the Kṣatriya ruler, have been used for him, so it is more likely that he was certainly not a Brahmin but a Kṣatriya feudal chief of the Candellas.

dominating the Ganges-Jumna valley since the days of Gandā and Vidyādhara, who attacked and killed Rājyapāla, the last Gurjara Pratihāra ruler of Kanauj in 1019 A.D., a year after his defeat at the hands of Sultan Mahmud of Ghazni.

This much is, undoubtedly, true that the sudden rise of the Candellas under Dhang and his successors, at the cost of their former overlords the Gurjara Pratihāras of Kānyakubja, greatly disturbed the balance of power in the Ganges-Jumna valley. And it is probable that in this confusion that prevailed at the dawn of the 11th century, this Rāṣṭrakūṭa family, referred to in so many different records, may have become masters of some territory in the Doab, under Candra or Candrapāla, the founder of the line according to the Budaun inscription and whose date can easily be placed in the 1st quarter of the 11th century A.D.[27] The political condition, as can be guessed by the very few references, we come across in the Muslim chronicles of these times, makes one almost sure of the existence of many petty independent chieftains possessing only a few important forts and the areas around them. There was no supreme authority, for the Gurjara Pratihāras had almost disappeared, and Rājyapāla perhaps lingered only as a petty chief retaining possession of Kanauj area at the mercy of their former feudatories, the Candellas, who, by this time, were at the zenith of their power.

These were the times when Mahumud for the first time turned his attention towards the rich plains of Northern India—politically which was weak, divided and warring against each other foı little selfish gains. In Hijri era 409=1018 A.D., he crossed for the first time the river Jumna and entered the Gangetic valley with a determination of reaching Kanauj. The progress of the Sultan through the Doab was a round of 'sieges, assaults and victories following each other in quick succession.' He came in contact with almost each and every important chief of Northern India, from

27 The Sahet Mahath inscription describes Madanapāla Rāṣṭrakūṭa as ruling in V.E. 1176=A.D. 1118-19, by assigning twenty years for each reign, his great-great-grandfather Candra should have reigned in the 1st quarter of the 11th century dying before 1038 A.D. whereas Candra Gāhaḍavāla died actually in 1100 A.D. (*JRAS.*, Jan. 1930, p. 119), he was contemporary of Gopāla and his son Tribhuvanapāla. Dr. H. C. Ray, Dr. R. S. Tripathi, Mr. D. D. Bhardwaja, Dr. G. H. Ojha all agree in assigning the first quarter of the 11th century to Candrapāla Raṣṭrakūṭa of Budaun record.

Lahore to Kaliñjara, during the course of his two expeditions in these parts of Hindustan.

It is very significant here to mention that Utbi[28] the contemporary Muslim writer definitely speaks of one Candrapāla (Bhur?), the Raja of Asi, which the Sultan attacked and captured after the fort of Munj, on his way back from Kanauj to Ghaznā. We are told of this prince that he was, 'one of the chief man and general of the Hindus. He was always engaged in a career of victory, and at one time he was at war with the Rai of Kanauj, when the campaign lasted a long time, but in the end the Rai (Rājyapāla) was compelled to retreat, after having put to some trouble the friends of the ruler of Asi! It was probably this Candra or Candrapāla was the ancestor of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa prince Gopāla, for we learn from the Muslim authorities that after his defeat at the hands of Mahmud he retreated to Kaliñjara and formed a confederacy against the foreign invader, with Bidā or Vidyādhara and Trilocanapāla Shahi of Lahore, whom the Sultan met and defeated on the river Rahib or Rāmgaṅgā, before he could join with his forces the new allies. It was the news of these alliances which led the Sultan to invade the Doab, the second time (Oct. 1019).[29]

It is clear from the accounts of the Muslim writers that Mahmud could not repeat the success, which he obtained against the effete Gurjara-Pratihāra rulers, when he captured the seven forts of Kanauj in a single day. Even after a considerable time, he evidently could not capture the fort of Kaliñjara and the campaign ended in mutual gifts and complements which appear to have been euphemistically represented by his historians as a tribute.'[30] It seems probable that after the return of Mahmud, Candra Rāṣṭrakūṭa also brought Kanauj under his sway and since then his successors were retaining possession of this ancient capital of the Pañcāla region.

Sometime after the death of Vidyādhara, the Candellas lost the supremacy over the neighbouring states and being overwhelmed by the attacks of the Kalacuris of Dhaval, even sunk into a position of petty rulers, and as already been said,[31] one of Vidyādhara's successors, Kīrtivarman had to be

28 Al'utbi, *Tarikh-i-Yamini*, Eng. Trans. Elliot, vol. II, pp. 46-47.

29 I draw these conclusions on the basis of proximity of the dates & areas i.e. between Kanauj and Asi and on the account of Ibn'ul Athir in his *Al'Tarikh-ul-Kamil*, 1874, vol. IX. pp. 115-16.

30 H. C. Ray, *D.H.N.I.*, vol. II. 'The Chapter on Candellas of Jejakbhukti.'

31 See *supra* pages 8 and 9.

re-established on the throne of Kaliñjara by Rāṣṭrakūṭa Gopāla, the great-grandson of Candra. It will not be too vague to think that perhaps the former obligations of the Candellas done towards his ancestor Candra, the founder of this Rāṭhor line, urged the faithful Gopāla, the lord of Gādhipura to fight for the throne of his overlord Kīrtivarman, who appears to have lost everything for sometime before the conquering arms of Luxmikaran, the Kalacuri prince of Dhaval.[32]

The death of Luxmikaran in 1070 A.D. also did not grant them any long respite from foreign interference. For within two decades of the Kalacuri prince, a new imperial power arose in the Ganges-Jumna valley, which by 1090 A.D. had already extended itself from Benares to Kanauj. And it was this dynasty which came to be known as the Gāhaḍavālas. *Diwan-i-Salman* of Masud,[33] the great Persian poet, who was living about this period, mentions about the occupation of Kanauj territory by Prince Mahmud, the son of Sultan Ibrahim Ghaznavi (1075-1099), where Mahmud left Cand Rai (generally believed to be Candra Gāhaḍavāla) in charge of the stable of elephants. It is quite likely that Candra Gāhaḍavāla annexed Kanauj with the consent of the victorious invader, to whom he also agreed to give some tax or tribute (Turuṣka Daṇḍa) in return, as this term occurs for the first time in his Candrāvatī grant of 1090 A.D.[34]

In view of these developments it seems probable that Gopālla in the last days of his reign had to face these new adversaries, and this proved

32 The destruction of the Candella kingdom is also referred to by Bilhaṇa, who describes Karan, the lord of Dhaval, as 'the death to the lord of Kaliñjara-mountain. (Kalah Kalañjara-giri-pateñjali). See Bilhaṇa's *Vikramāṅkacarita:* Sarga I, vv. 102 f. it also indicates that one of the predecessors of Kīrtivarman may have even lost his life in the wars with the Kalacuris.

33 Elliot, vol. IV, p. 524, *IHQ.*, IX, p. 956. Suggestions are not wanting that the Rai Jaipāla whom prince Mahmud defeated near Agra was a mistake for the name of Gopāla, the then lord of Gādhipura. See *Journal of Indian History*, vol. XV, pt. I, p. 24.

34 *EI.*, vol. IX, p. 302-5. The Candella overlords, at these critical times of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa family at Kanauj, were not slow to help their saviours. The Māu Stone inscription of Madanavarman (*EI.*, vol. I, pp. 195-207, see verse 38) indicates that Sallakṣaṇavarman, the son and successor of Kīrtivarman fought some unknown enemies in the 'Āntarvedi Viṣaya.' The fragmentary Jhansi epigraph also refers that one Sallakṣaṇ fought with the Muhammedan cavalry. If his object in invading the Ganges-Jumna valley was to capture Kanauj, he may have come in conflict with the Gāhaḍavāla Candra and the Turkish cavalry of Prince Mahmud.

a fatal strain for him in old age. His son and successor Tribhuvanapāla perhaps continued the fight for existence against these allied forces. The silence of the Sahet Mahath inscription about him suggests that he seems to have died fighting, and his brother Madanapāla submitted to the Gāhaḍavālas and this is why the title *Gādhipurādhipa* is not repeated with Madanapāla Rāṣṭrakūṭa in the above epigraph. The statement in the Budaun record about this ill-fated Tribhuvanapāla also implies that he died fighting and his younger brother was made king in his place.[35] The victorious Candra Gāhaḍavāla seems, however, to have allowed Madanapāla to remain in possession of Kanauj and the neighbouring territory as his vassal, shorn of the much coveted designation Gādhipurādhipa. The local rulers of Kanauj from the time of Candradeva onwards were the Rāṣṭrakūṭas, for we find that the members of this family were ruling over the place long after the Gāhaḍavāla suzerainty had established over that reputed capital of Harṣavardhana.[36] The Gāhaḍavālas continued to reside as before at Benares which was the first capital of their kingdom.

The chronology of the later Rāṭhor rulers of Kanauj is difficult to ascertain as it is not given in any contemporary record. But by assigning to each of Madanapāla's successors an average reign of 20 years, the date of Amṛtapāla, the last but one named in the Budaun record, can approximately be placed between the years 1185 and 1200 A.D., and thus he becomes the contemporary of Jaicandra, who was attacked and slain by Shahb-ud-din Ghori in the battle of Chandāwar in 1194 A.D. As the Budaun record mentions about him that he frightened the enemies by the sharp sword of his hand and was succeeded by his younger brother Lakhanapāla, it is quite possible that he died young most likely in the same battle along with his over-lord Jaicandra. As no separate mention of conquest of Kanauj proper is made in any of the contemporary Muslim authorities till the reign of Iltutmish, who conquered 'Kinnauj-i-shergarh' for the first time and brought the terri-

35 *EI.*, vol. I, p. 62, line 3.—"Afterwards his (Gopāla's) son Tribhuvana protected the earth, humbling the multitude of enemies (and in consequence) endowed with fame. When (this) his brother by the degree of fate had gone to heaven, then the same land was ruled over by the prince Madanapāla."

36 Even prior to the discovery of Budaun record Cunningham definitely knew the names Devapāla and Lakhanapāla as princes in Kanauj. See *EI.*, vol. II, p. 63 fn. 6, *Archaeological Survey of India,* vol. XI, p. 1. *Ibid.*, vol. XX. pp. 13, 14; *Ibid.*, vol. XI, pp. 128-30.

tory of Budaun and Oudh under subjection,[37] we can infer that the battle of Chandāwar had not put an end to the feudatory kingdom of Kanauj, and Lakhanapāla retained possession of the city till the accession of Iltutmish in 1211 A.D. But soon after, even the last stronghold of the Rāṭhors was also attacked by him, which even endangered their very existence in those fertile parts of the country. He probably died opposing the Muslim onslaught and this ended the rule of the 'Rāṣṭrakūṭas in Kānyakubja.' His grandson Sihāji who must have been then a boy aged about 16 or 17, having no other course left, migrated to Marwar, where he established himself in 1212 A.D.[38]

It will thus be seen that the family traditions of the Rāṭhors of Marwar, claiming descent from Rāṣṭrakūṭas of Kanauj is grounded in fact and cannot be rejected as a myth. This tradition is supported and confirmed by an inscription dated 1619 A.D.[39] which records that Duhad, the grandson of Rāo Sihā was a 'Sūryavaṃśī Kanaujī.' All bardic chronicles are unanimous in maintaining that it was in the time of this very prince Duhad (d. in 1309 A.D.) that the tutelary diety was brought from Kanauj. Moreover, the possession of the historical sandalwood throne of the emperors of Kanauj, brought by the founder Sihāji from there, and which Rāo Bikāji acquired from Jodhpur among the family heir-looms and is to this day preserved in the Bikaner fort,[40] supports the fact that the Rāṭhors did migrate from Kanauj.

The question, however, arises as to why the present ruling houses claim descent from Jaicandra. It is not absolutely impossible that the mistake was unconscious. It may have been caused by the fact that Jaicandra was

37 *Tabakat-i-Nasiri*, vol. I, p. 627-29.

38 Dr. Ojha's date 1243 A.D. is improbable for it leaves a gap of about 40 years between the defeat of his family and his migration to Marwar. At his death Sihā must have been an old man of at least 70 for his sons are mentioned as grown-up men during his life-time, taking part in expeditions. The fact that Sri Seta or Seta or Setram, father of Rao Sihāji according to the Bithu inscription, is referred as Kunwar till long after his own death, it hints that he probably died a prince or Kunwar without getting any opportunity for accession. Almost all the bardic chronicles mention that Kunwar Seta died fighting against the Muslims at Kanauj perhaps just after Lakhanapāla and ever since his son, Siha a young man of 15 or 18 by 1212 A.D. escaped to the safe and secluded parts of Marwar.

39 *JRAS.*, Jan. 1930, p. 117.

40 Powlett, *Gazetteer of the Bikaner State*, p. 9; Alakhdhari, *Raja Rai Singh*, a monograph, p. 7. Ojha, *Hist. of Jodhpur*, vol. I, p. 250.

at the time of Muslim attack actually the sovereign ruler of Kanauj and the overlord of the feudatories of the place. The bards of Marwar being ignorant of Rāṣṭrakūṭa history and knowing merely the name of Sihāji's ancestor Candra, tacked the genealogy of their patrons to that of the Gāhaḍavālas whose ancestor too was one Candra, a ruler of Kanauj, and so probably was produced the genealogy of the Marwar Rāṭhors that has come down to us and is to be seen in the Bikaner Praśasti of Raja Rai Singhji. It appears that Cand Bardai's omission of the Gāhaḍavālas in the traditional list of 36 clans and the application of the epithets 'Kamdhaj' and 'Rāṭhor' to Jaicandra in his immoral *Raso,* the first in the long list of the bardic chronicles, led to perpetuate the mistake. It was on the authority of this classical work of Rājasthan that the later writers and Praśastikāras, even Dayal Das being no exception, supported the tradition, however vitiated though it was by the fact that Gāhaḍavālas and Rāṣṭrakūṭas are two different clans.

But the theory as it exists is far from the truth, for the Gāhaḍavālas never call themselves Rāṭhors (Rāṣṭrakūṭas) in any of their grants, and we know for certain that the two clans inter-marry and differ from one another in their 'Gotra' being 'Kāśyapa' and 'Gotam' respectively. Secondly, inscriptional evidences testify to the fact that Rāṣṭrakūṭa princes ruled over tracts of Marwar long before the rise and the supposed migration of the Gāhaḍavālas from Kanauj. Thirdly, Cand Bardāi's omission of the Gāhaḍavālas in the list of 36 clans is at best an 'argumentum execellentis,' although they are elsewhere[41] mentioned by him in a way which shows that he was aware of their separate entity.[42]

The absurdity seems to have reached in the attempt made by some prominent writers like Pt. Ramkaran and Pt. Bisheswar Nath Rau, who despite the knowledge of these inscriptions, try to perpetuate the false theory and go so far as to assert that Candra of the Budaun epigraph is identical with the Gāhaḍavāla Candra, the conqueror of Kanauj according to the copper-plates.[43] But we have seen that the chronological considerations

41 In the Alha-Prastāva: e.g. we read "Sajji Gaharwar Gohil ane'ka," i.e. there were many Gaharwars and Gohils arrayed. (Elliot, *Races of N.W.P. and Oudh,* vol. I, pp. 122 and foot note).

42 Ojha, *Hist. of Rajputana,* IV, Pt. I. (Jodhpur State) pp. 136-44, R. S. Tripathi, *History of Kanauj,* p. 300.

43 *Sir Asutosh Mukerjee Silver Jubilee vol.* Pt. II, p. 259; *JRAS.*, January, 1930, p. 116.

distinctly go against this sort of forced attempt to keep up anyhow with the tradition as it is.[44] Dr. Altekar's[45] conclusion that the Rāṭhor families at and in the vicinity of Kanauj were the branches of the Imperial Rāṣṭrakūṭas of the Deccan, which survived the extinction of their sovereignty in the North is sounder and more convincing.. The preceding pages have shown that Sihāji of Marwar claimed descent from Candra Rāṣṭrakūṭa, who was a descendant of the Imperial Rāṣṭrakūṭas of yore.

M. L. MATHUR

44 See the excellent article on the topic by Mr. D. D. Bhardwaja, *Journal of Indian History*, vol. XV, Pt. I, April, 1936, pp. 24-29.

45 Dr. A. S. Altekar, *Rastrakutas and their Times*, p. 17.

Early Industrial Organisation in North India

Tools and mechanical power are not the sole means for the production of wealth. There is the necessity of organisation, combination and laws regulating business. The progress of Indian arts and crafts depended in no small degree on the organisational genius of the people. The industrial combines in ancient India have generally been termed 'guilds' as they bear a close resemblance to those prototypes of mediaeval Europe.

Origin of Combination: Śreṇī, Pūga

Sanskrit works use many words with references to local bodies, the distinction between which is not precisely defined. Generally however, the terms *śreṇī* and *pūga* go for industrial and commercial guilds.[1] Kaiyaṭa and Tattvabodhinī explain *śreṇī* in Pāṇini (II. 1. 59) as an assembly of persons following a common craft or trade in a common commodity (*ekena śilpena paṇyena vā ye jīvanti teṣām samūhaḥ śreṇīḥ*). The commentators on Manu (VIII. 41) and Nārada (I. 7) explain it nearly in the same sense, but in the *Arthaśāstra*, *śreṇī* is either a guild of workmen (II. 4) or a military clan (VII. 16) or communities like those of Kāmbojas, Surāṣṭras and Kṣatriyas who subsist by agriculture, trade and military service. *Pūga* is a craft or trade guild according to the commentators of Nārada (X. 2) and Yājñavalkya (II. 31). But both Vīramitrodaya and Mitākṣarā distinguish it from the *śreṇī* as an association of persons of different castes and occupations while *śreṇī* is a more limited assembly of people of same craft or occupation though possibly of different castes.

Urge to union

As Vṛhaspati points out, anarchy and insecurity in business were the earliest impulse to combination (XVII. 5 f.). The danger came not only from the conditions of the market but also from the severity of the civil law in regard to certain crafts.[2] In fact guild life is the characteristic of an advanced stage of economic progress when "the individual mechanics,

1 And sometimes *gāma, nigama, gaṇa, saṃgha, samūha, samiti* etc.

2 E.g. the laws of the *Arthaśāstra* on gold and silversmiths. Cf. Manu,— "But the king shall cause of goldsmith who behaves dishonestly, the most nocuous

artisans or traders have sufficient business instincts developed in them, and have achieved sufficient success in their several businesses to appreciate the necessity of organising themselves into a community for the purpose of promoting their individual and collective interests."[3] The idea of organising on co-operative basis was inherent in the division of castes and allocation of functions. The Vaiśyas were called *gaṇasya* in distinction from the Brāhmaṇas and Kṣatriyas as co-operation was necessary for acquiring wealth (*Br. Up.*, 1. 4. 12 and Śaṅkara's Com.). Within the Vaiśya or commoner caste the emergence of traders as a distinct body from agriculture and cattle-rearing signifies a further stage in this progress.

Development

The plea of Geldner and of Roth for the existence of guilds in Vedic literature has been keenly disputed. But the words *śreṣṭhin* and *śraiṣṭhya* used in Vedic texts[4] would appear from their contexts to mean 'headman of a guild' and 'his position of primacy.' For more positive evidence of institutional growth we have to look to a much later age. "As the Buddhists placed the warrior caste before the priest-caste and gave unrestricted freedom to the third caste, it is not wonderful that guild-life is characteristic of a Buddhistic environment."[5] Early Pāli literature is full of references to guilds, and heads of guilds occupy the highest social position. They are great householders always represented in the social set of kings and princes. References in the Epics and in subsequent records, epigraphic and literary are equally informative. In the Śāntiparva it is fully realised that the *gaṇa* when united, acquires great wealth by the strength and prowess of its constituents (*arthaścaivā' dhigamyante saṃghāta balapauruṣaiḥ*, 107. 15).

Organisational structure

Localisation of industries: in theory

In the origin and consolidation of guilds, there were four important factors. Certain industries were specialised at certain places. Within the same district or town again each industry tended to be localised at a parti-

of all thorns, to be cut to pieces with razors" IX. 292. In Viṣṇu guilds of metal-workers and of smiths of gold and silver are pre-eminent.

3 R. K. Mukerji, *Local Self-government in Ancient India.*

4 For references see Macdonell & Keith, *Vedic Index.*

5 Washburn Hopkins, *India Old and New*, p. 171.

cular area of its own. The *Arthaśāstra* ordains that merchants trading with scents, garlands, grains and liquids (*gandhamālya dhānya rasapanyāḥ*) are to settle in the eastern quarter of a town. Traders in cooked rice, liquor and flesh (*pakkānnasurāmāṃsapanyāḥ*) and prostitutes (*rūpa-jīvāḥ*) to the south. Artisans manufacturing worsted threads, cotton threads, babmoo-mats, skins, armours, weapons and gloves and the Śūdras to the west (*urṇāsūtraveṇucarmavarmaśastrāvaraṇakāravaḥ*). Smiths and workers in precious stones (*lohamaṇikāravaḥ*) find place with the tutelary deity and Brāhmaṇas in the north (II. 4). The *Agnipurāṇa* makes a totally different allocation except for the prostitutes and for the religious people. The goldsmiths are to be in the south-east corner of the town; the professional dancers and musicians and the harlots in the south; the stage-managers, the carriagemen and fishermen in the south-west. Those who deal in cars and chariots, weapons and cutlery in the west; liquor merchants, officers and employees in the north-west; religious people in the north; fruit-vendors in the north-east. This is in the outermost circle. In the inner blocks are the military, the civilians and the elite of the town. The *Mayamata* gives a more complicated plan. To the south,—a little to the sides should be the weavers, to the north wheelwrights or carters (*cakriṇām*). The outermost sites are divided into several blocks reserved for (a) fish, meat, dry food and vegetables, (b) staple food, (c) basins and pottery, (d) brass and bronze, (e) cloth shops, (f) rice and paddy, (g) tailoring; salt and oils, (h) perfumeries and flowers, all serially arranged intervening residential sites. Along the roads within the boulevard are assigned stalls of jewels and precious stones, gold, clothes, drugs and condiments like *mañjiṣṭhā*, pepper, pipal, ginger, honey, ghee, oil, medicines, etc. In ports or in trade marts stalls are not to be inter-residential but more compact, set up in continuous rows on either sides of the highway, to secure economic efficiency (Ch. 10, ll. 154-83). In a different order of planning, artisans and manual workers are placed in the outermost zone of the city—to the east or north—potters, barbers and other craftsmen; to the north-west—fishermen; to the west—butchers; to the north—oilmen; to the south-east or north-west—architects,—further off, washermen; one *krośa* (2 miles) off from the east,—sweepers (chs. 9, 29).

Localisation of industries: in practice

Plans differ in theory and in practice. But there is no doubt that industries and occupations tended to be segregated from one another partly

under the same circumstances which lead to the localisation of modern industries. In the towns of the Madhyadeśa we come across the ivory-workers' street (*dantakāravīthiṃ* in Benares, *Jāt.* I. 320 f., II. 197), the lotus street (*uppalavīthi*, in Sāvatthi, II. 321), the washermen's street (*rajakavīthim*, IV. 82), the street of the Vessas (*vessānāṃ vīthiyā*, VI. 485), the weavers' quarter (*tantavitataṭṭhānam*, I. 356; *pesakāravīthi*, *Dhp. A.* I. 424) and a street in the caterers' quarters (*odonikagharavīthiyaṃ*, III. 49). As in the town people with the same industrial pursuit flocked in a specified street or quarter, in the countryside, they congregated in the same village settlement and formed a more developed organisation. A carpenter's village with 500 or 1,000 families is often seen in the frontier of the state of Kāsi or in the outskirts of the city of Benares (*kāsiraṭṭhe......paccantagāme bahū vaḍḍhakī vasanti*, I. 247; *kulasahassanivāso mahāvaḍḍhakigāmo*, IV. 159; II. 18, 405; IV. 207). There was a weaver's village near Benares under a headman (Dhammapāla's Com. on Therig, Ps. 157 ff.) and a smith's village of 1,000 houses (*sahassakuṭiko kammāragāmo*, III. 281) is also referred to. Brāhmaṇas formed similar villages for their scholastic and religious activities (VI. 514; Mn. 41, 150).[6] The craftsmen purveyed their goods to the people of neighbouring towns and villages or executed orders from them jointly or severally (Vṛ. XVII. 11).

After localisation the next factor was leadership. The localised industry, the *gāma* or the *seṇi* was frequently organized under a leader called *jeṭṭhaka*. We hear of *jeṭṭhakas* of carpenters, smiths, weavers, garland-makers (III. 405) as well as of other inferior crafts and of marines, thieves, caravan-guards etc. Fick surmises that his office was hereditary and honorary, based on skill rather than on age. He is prominent in royal court (III. 281, V. 282) and rich and of great substance (III. 281). He seems to have combined the functions of the village headman, the village syndic and the president of the local guild.

Heredity of occupation

The third factor was heredity of occupation. From the frequent use of the suffixes *kula* and *putta* after a craft name, it would appear that a family stuck to the same craft the father handing down to his son his capital,

6 For villages of fishermen, hunters, thieves, *caṇḍālas*, *veṇas*, *naḷakāras* etc. See my papers on Five Hīnajātis, *Indian Culture*, VII. 3 and Hīnasippas, *Ibid.*, VIII. 1.

credit and accumulated experience. Later, during the period of the later law-books (Manu etc.) with the development of trade transactions "the significance and inner compactness deepened, and being similar to the castes on account of the traditional organisation and the hereditariness of membership, they gradually got........, as certain rules and customs with reference to marriage and interdining were developed, the appearance of real caste, till they finally became the modern trading classes."[7]

Ācariya and Antevāsi

But occupation was not always rigidly determined by heredity or caste. This is proved by the copious literary references particularly in the Pāli canon to the master and the pupil, the *ācariyo* and the *antevāsi* in an establishment where the latter undergoes a course of apprenticeship under the former in an art which he chooses to pursue in future. His rôle is not always that of a learner,—for sometimes he excels his master in skill (*Jāt.* V. 290 ff.). It is very often that of an assistant or a servant akin to the worst conditions of wage labour.[8]

Terms of apprenticeship

From Nārada's rule it seems that the period of apprenticeship was very similar to the condition of bondage. A youngman desirous of learning a trade was free to do so. He lived with a master, worked for him and was fed and taught by him (also Vṛ. XVI. 6). Like a slave by his master he should be treated as a son.[9] He might not be made to do any other work than the one he was learning. The master might compel the apprentice's return if he ran away. In case the apprentice learns the craft more quickly than stipulated in the contract, the time left over shall be his master's and all the profit derived from the apprentice during that period shall accrue to his master (also *Yāj.* II. 187). It follows that he was bound down for a given length of time and that the advantage from his work was wholly his master's.

7 Fick, *Die Sociale Gliederung*, p. 179.

8 In fact Nārada treats them in the same chapter along with hired servants and slaves.

9 Cf. *Mv.* I. 32. 1, where Buddha says that the *ācariya* ought to consider the *antevāsika* as a son, the *antevāsika* should consider the *ācariya* as a father. He exhorts the *bhikkhus* to live the first ten years in dependence on the *ācariya*. Of course the rule relates to education in sacred lore and not in a craft.

If agreed upon in advance he might be rewarded with a fee on attaining proficiency, but he should continue to work for his master till the stated time was up (V. 16-21).

Guild-laws: evolution

The last and the strongest factor binding the constituencies as a close homogenous unit was the operation of the guild laws. The evolution of these laws may be traced back roughly to the first six centuries before the Christian era in the form of conventions taking shape. The tendency is indicated in two rules of Gautama. "Laws of districts, castes and families, when not opposed to sacred texts, are an authority;" and "ploughmen, merchants, herdsmen, money-lenders and artisans (are also authority) for their respective classes" (XI. 20 f.; Vāś. I. 17, XIX, 7). While Gautama is an advocate of local usage and law of caste, Manu reckons guild laws as on a par with those of castes and localities. A king should settle the laws only after a careful examination of the laws of castes, districts, guilds (*śreṇī*) and families (VIII. 41; Yāj. I. 360 f., Nārada, X. 2). Vṛhaspati goes farther to enjoin that the king must approve of whatever the guilds do to other people in accordance with their rules whether that is cruel or kind (XVII. 18).

Apportionment of shares and liabilities

These rules were meant to regulate distribution of profits and liabilities, investments and dividends among the members. According to the *Artha-śāstra,* guilds of workmen (*saṃghabhṛtāḥ*) and those who carry on co-operative work (*sambhūya samutthātāraḥ*) shall divide their earnings (*vetanaṃ*) either equally or as agreed upon among themselves (III. 14). The rules of Nārada and Vṛhaspati on *sambhūya samutthānam* or joint transaction of business are more elaborate and relate to trade guilds as well as to craft guilds. The partners must share all legitimate expenses of business such as those incurred by (a) purchase and sale of merchandise, (b) provision for necessary travelling, (c) wages of labourers, (d) realisation of dues, (e) freight, (f) care of treasures (Nār. III. 4 and Vivādaratnākara's com.) The loss, expenses and profit of the business are to be shared by each partner according to the share contributed by him to the joint stock. A partner is responsible for any loss due to his want of care or any action without the assent or against the instructions of his co-partners (Nār. III. 5; Vṛ. XIV. 9). Similarly he is entitled to a special remuneration for special profit gained

through his individual action (Nār. III. 6; Vṛ. XIV. 19). The master craftsman is entitled to a double share of the profits. So also the head of an engineering firm building a house or a temple or digging a tank (Vṛ. XIV. 29).

Rules of contract

The guilds took contract for work. The *Arthaśāstra* lays down its rules or terms between the transacting parties (III. 14). Rules of contract bear also on the internal affairs of a guild. Vṛhaspati says that a contract executed by one is binding on all (XIV. 5). The rule of the *Arthaśāstra* is that a healthy person who deserts his company (of contract artisans) after work has been begun shall be fined 15 *paṇas;* for none shall of his own accord leave his company. One found to have stealthily neglected his share of work shall be shown mercy for the first time and given proportional work anew with promise of proportional share in earnings. For neglecting again and going elsewhere he shall be thrown out of the company (*pravāsanam*).

Sanction

For a glaring offence (*mahāparādha*) he shall be treated as condemned (*duṣyavad-ācaret,* III. 14). The Dharmaśāstras do not show the same leniency. According to Nārada and Vṛhaspati he who disobeys the laws or injures the joint stock is to be banished. A member who fails to implement an agreement entered into by his association is to be banished and his property confiscated. According to Yāñavalkya dishonesty is punished by expulsion from the guild and forfeiture of share in the profits. A disabled partner may however appoint a substitute to do his part of the work (II. 265).

Judicial authority

The threat of expulsion for indiscipline and dishonesty was the sanction of the guild laws. Accordingly the Association had complete judicial authority over its members. Vṛhaspati says that the partners are to be judges and witnesses in deciding their own disputes (XIV. 6). These disputes did not necessarily relate to affairs of business, they might be strictly personal. Later law-books emphasise the jurisdiction of local, popular courts like the *kula, śreṇī, gaṇa* and *pūga,*—graded in an ascending order of superiority (Nār. Intr. 7; Vṛ. I. 28-30; Yāj. II. 30). This juridical power is recognised in the

Buddhist literature. A man may be tried by his guild (*pūgamajjhagato, Mn.* 41, 114). Its interference is invoked to settle differences between the members and their wives (*Vin.* IV. 226). In the *Suttavibhaṅga* it is forbidden to ordain the wife of a member unless his guild had sanctioned it. This rigid control over the affairs of a well-knit corporation was exercised by an executive body of two to five persons presumably with a presiding head who also supervised the affairs of smaller associations (Vṛ. XVII. 10).

Guild Finance

Funds: earnings and expenditures

The finance of the guild consisted of individual earnings and contributions, fines and confiscations on delinquent members, king's subsidy (Vṛ. XVII. 24) and profits from executions of orders (Yāj. II. 190). Good profits accrued from the investment of the deposits which the guilds received from the king and the public as banks.[10] They might in their turn earmark a part of their capital to be set aside as safe deposit. The *Arthaśāstra* prescribes on this point that those who can be expected to relieve misery, who can give instructions to artisans, who can be trusted with deposits, who can plan artistic work after their own design, and who can be relied upon by guilds of artisans may receive the deposits of guilds. The guilds shall receive their deposits back in time of distress.

अर्थ्यप्रतिकाराः कारुशासितारः सन्निक्षेप्तारः स्वचित्तकारवः श्रेणीप्रमाणा निक्षेपं गृह्णीयुः। विपत्तौ श्रेणी निक्षेपं भजेत्, (IV. I).

The incomes were distributed as (a) dividend among the members, (b) charity, (c) fresh investment.

देयं वा निःस्ववृद्धान्ध-स्त्री-बालातुर-रोगिषु ।
सान्तानिकादिषु तथा धर्म एष सनातनः ॥
ततो लभ्येत यत्किञ्चित् सर्वेषामेव तत्समम् ।
षाण्मासिकं मासिकं वा विभक्तव्यं यथांशतः ॥—बृहस्पति

The Smṛti rules find positive illustrations from life. Four Benares weavers plied their trade jointly and used to divide their earnings in five shares keeping four for their own and disposing of the fifth for charity.[11]

10 For the banking activity of the *śreṇī* see the *Nasik Cave Inscriptions.*

11 *Vārāṇasiyaṃ pesakārā ekato hutvā tena kammena laddhakaṃ pañca koṭṭhāse katvā cattaro koṭṭhāse paribhuñjiṃsu pañcamaṃ gahetvā ekato va dānaṃ dadiṃsu, Jāt.* IV. 475.

Benevolent public works and religious contributions received equal attention. Among the votive offerings at Sāñcī one is attributed to the guild of ivory-carvers. A cave inscription in Junnar records the gift of a seven-celled cave and of a cistern by the *śreṇī* of corn-dealers.[12] A Gwalior Inscription (876 A.D.) records a temple-grant by a town where guilds of oil-millers (*tailikaśreṇī*) and of gardners (*mālikaśreṇī*) levy a toll among themselves and assign it to the temple.[13]

Relation with the State

Guild vis-à-vis the state: guardianship

The guilds while enjoying an autonomous life stood in close relation to the civil authority. The legal masters enjoin that a paternal and fostering care should be extended to industrial combinations. Not only must the king respect the guild laws but also must see that members thereof followed their own laws (Yāj. I. 361; Viṣ. III. 2; Nār. X. 2). To enforce observance of these laws and compacts among members the king may resort to the penal sanctions of fine and banishment (Manu VIII. 219-21; Viṣ. V. 168; Yāj. II. 192). In the case of a dispute between a guild and its head, the king shall arbitrate and he shall restrain when a whole guild boycotts a member out of hatred (Vṛ. XVII. 19-20). He subsidises a guild when necessary. He receives appeal. He has the prerogative of taxing it to his pleasure.

Disputes and Arbitration

The *Jātakas* offer several instances of guild disputes (II. 12. 52; IV. 43; VI. 332). The source of these quarrels is nowhere disclosed. That there might be more than one guild of the same craft at one place, e.g. the two weavers' guilds at Govardhana (Nasik Cave Ins.) may be a vague surmise. To remedy this state of affairs, a king is said to have inaugurated the office of the *bhaṇḍāgārika* who carried with it "the judgship over all guilds" (*sabbaseṇinām vicaraṇatthāya*, IV. 43) and "whose function possibly referred to a supervision of the goods made or dealt with by a guild or guilds and not confined only to the king's exchequer."[14]

12 Bühler and Burgess, *Arch. Sur. W. Ind.*, IV. 10. 13 *EI.*, I. 20.
14 Mrs. Rhys Davids, *Cambridge History*, p. 207.

Other relations

The king's role of guardianship is reflected in many other references. He collects all the guilds (*sabbaseṇiyo*) along with his subjects to demonstrate his almsgiving (*Jāt*. IV. 499). He assembles the four castes, the eighteen guilds (*aṭṭhāraso seṇiyo*) and his army for a procession to receive his son (VI. 22). Among ministers, officials and notables are the chiefs of the guilds (*śreṇīmukhyāḥ*) who are ordained by Bharata to come out and greet Rāma on his return from exile (*Rām*., VI. 129. 4). The king was in intimate touch with the *jeṭṭhaka* and probably this was the agency through which he exercised his powers of supervision.

Guild militia: threat to civil power

But the guild was not always the submissive ward. As a necessary corollary to its political power and autonomous life and from the need to defend its treasures the *śreṇī* came to form a militia and possess military power enough to be a perpetual worry to the king. Prince Duryodhana when defeated in the hands of the Gandharvas was ashamed of returning home and meeting his relatives, priests and heads of guilds (*gaṇamukhyāḥ*, *Mbh*., III. 248. 16). The *Arthaśāstra* is at its wit's end to keep them under subjugation and to destroy them by sowing seeds of discord. In the Śānti-parva their power is reckoned as equal to that of the army; their heads must be 'talked over' by spies when the king would subdue another kingdom; they are 'supported by union' and the king is especially warned not to tax them too heavily, lest they become disaffected, which is considered as a grave calamity (107. 10-32).

The Organised Crafts

In the land where and in the time when the Jātaka stories took shape there were eighteen industries which were organised into guilds (*aṭṭhāraso seṇiyo*, I. 267, 314; III. 281; IV. 411; VI. 22). Four of these are especially mentioned viz. carpenters (*vaḍḍhaki*), smiths (*kammāra*), leather-dressers (*cammakāra*) and painters (*cittakāra*) (VI. 427). Among craft guilds Vṛhaspati enumerates those of goldsmiths, silversmiths, workers in other base metals (*kupya*), carpenters, stone-dressers (*samskartā*) and leather-workers (XIV. 27). The Nasik Cave Inscriptions refer to the guilds of weavers, of potters (? *kularika*), of workers with water-pumps (*odayantrika*) and of oil millers (*tilapisaka*) (12. V, 15. vii). A Mathurā Brāhmī Inscription of

Huviṣka's time records the existence of a *rāka* (?) guild and a guild of flour-makers (*samitakara*).[15] The Junnar Buddhist Cave Inscriptions similarly speak of one of bamboo-workers (*vasakāra*). another of braziers (*kāsākāra*) and a third of corn-dealers (*dhaṃñika*).[16] The collective gift of the ivory-workers at Vedisā (Sāñcī In. *c.* 189) probably indicates that these artisans formed a *śreṇī*. Later inscriptions and inscriptions from the south add copiously to the list.

Guild Activities: powers and functions

The autonomy and entity of the guild was as much legal as real. It had its distinguishing colours (*Mbh.*, III. 206. 6). In the preparations made by the royal family and citizens of Mathurā to witness the wrestling bout between Kṛṣṇa and Kaṃsa, pavilions were erected for different companies and corporations with flags representing the implements and emblems of the several crafts (*svakarma-dravyayuktābhiḥ patākābhiḥ; Harivaṃsa,* 86. 5). If the *nigama* of the coins of Taxila and of the Bhīṭā seals refers to town corporations and not to industrial guilds, the Basārh seals of the time of the Gupta emperors show a great advancement in guild activity referring to and giving the names of bankers (*śreṣṭhin*), traders (*sārthavāha*) and merchants (*kulika*), their members and their leaders (*prathama-kulika*). The civic affairs of the *nigama* were dominated by powerful trade and craft guilds.

General traits: strength & weakness

The guild served not only as a bank receiving deposits at interest but also as a trustee and executor of endowments. An endowment in a guild bank is reported to be permanent so long as the guild retains its unity even if it moves to a different place.[17] This shows its mobility and organisational perfection and the public confidence reposed in it. The 1,000 families of carpenters in a *gāma* who shifted wholesale overnight in boats and settled in an island in mid-sea is a typical illustration of this mobility (*Jāt.* IV. 159). Another example is a guild of skilled (*prathitaśilpāḥ*) silk-weavers who migrated from Lāṭa or southern Gujarat into the city of Dāsapura and constructed "a noble and unequalled temple of the bright-rayed sun." After this the members began pursuing different occupations, e.g. music, story-

15 *EI.*, XXI. 10. 16 Bühler and Burgess, *op. cit.*, IV. 10, 24, 27.
17 Fleet, *Gupta Inscriptions*, No. 16.

telling (*kathāvidaḥ*), religious discourses (*dharmaprasaṅga*); some remained weavers, others changed into astrologers (*jyotiṣa*) or warriors (*samarapragalbhāḥ*) or recluse (*vijita-viṣayasaṅga*). Still the corporate organisation was in tact and the temple which had fallen into disrepair was restored by the same guild after a period of thirty-six years from its construction.[18] The larger civic conscience and communal spirit thus stood against the disruptive tendencies of contradictory tastes and occupations. This also shows the extent of intellectual life and culture nursed in a mere craft guild and the amount of independent development and freedom of choice permitted within its scope. But this is not the *śreṇī* of the *Jātakas* and of the *Smṛtis*. We miss the team playing their shuttle together, the rules regulating collective contracts for a job, the allocation of shares and dues from a joint-stock. The institution imbibes cultural propensities and develops conflicting tastes in a growing urban atmosphere. It has lost its fundamental character of manual labour and the basic unity grown upon it. The earlier *śreṇī* was an association of capitalist workers serving under the strictest regimentation who could ill-afford to pursue the so-called cultures and refinements as means of livelihood. The story of the Mandasor Inscription sets forth the first stage of disintegration of a well-knit craft-guild with common economic interests. The process is hidden under the plaster of a higher but loose synthesis maintained only by tradition and personal association.

ATINDRA NATH BOSE

18 Fleet, *Gupta Inscriptions*, p. 86.

MISCELLANY

The Viṣṇu-stuti and Kṛṣṇa-karṇāmṛta

In the *Ādyar Library Bulletin*, vol. viii, no. 1, February 1944 pp. 37-46, Mr. H. G. Narahari has given an interesting account of an old manuscript, dated 1418 A.D., which purports to contain a work entitled *Viṣṇu-stuti*, ascribed in the colophon to Bilvamaṅgala. In this connexion the learned writer refers to my treatment of the text-problem of Bilvamaṅgala's *Kṛṣṇa-karṇāmṛta*, but since his criticism appears to involve some misunderstanding of my position, I take this opportunity of considering how far the material adduced entirely disposes (as Mr. Narahari thinks) of my suggestion of the spuriousness of the Second and Third Āśvāsas, included in the South Indian recension, and the genuineness of the First Āśvāsa, alone of the *Kṛṣṇa-karṇāmṛta*, given uniformly in the Bengal recension.

It should be understood at the outset that although ascribed to Bilvamaṅgala, the work described by Mr. Narahari is called *Viṣṇu-stuti*, and not *Kṛṣṇa-karṇāmṛta*. The two works, on his showing, are not co-extensive in content and arrangement; nor can the one, as we shall see presently, be regarded as a version of the other. His claim, therefore, that his manuscript is one of *Kṛṣṇa-karṇāmṛta* is as unwarranted as the heading "An Early Manuscript of the *Kṛṣṇa-karṇāmṛta* of Bilvamaṅgala" of his article is surprising and misleading. In reality his article gives an account of another interesting but independent work ascribed to Bilvamaṅgala, which is of the same type as the similarly ascribed *Sumaṅgala-stotra*, *Bilvamaṅgala-stotra*, *Kṛṣṇa-stotra* and *Bilvamaṅgala-kośa-kāvya*, discussed in the Introduction to my edition of the *Kṛṣṇa-karṇāmṛta* (Dacca University, 1938), pp. xxi-xxiv, and the *Bāla-gopāla-stuti* considered in the Addenda at pp. 371-78. Eggeling and Bendall noticed the manuscripts of the first two works respectively, while O. C. Gangoly and W. Norman Brown gave an account of the last work; but none of them claimed, as they could not indeed claim, that these works are identical with the *Kṛṣṇa-karṇāmṛta* or even represent a version of it. I have already discussed the question at some length, and have tried to show that these apocryphal works are ***independent*** collections of miscellaneous Kṛṣṇaite verses ascribed to Bilvamaṅgala, which supply the nucleus of the Second and Third Āśvāsas of the South Indian recension. We can, therefore, trace a good number of the verses of these

two Āśvāsas in all of them, but no verse of the First Āśvāsa occurs in any of them. This conclusion is not assailed in the least by the material revealed by Mr. Narahari's discovery. On the contrary, it only confirms what I anticipated when I said that "we should be able to trace also other verses if we could examine in detail all the works assigned by tradition to Bilvamaṅgala."

For, Mr. Narahari's *Viṣṇu-stuti* is exactly another such miscellaneous collection of Kṛṣṇaite verses in which a large number of verses from the Second and Third Āśvāsas are similarly traceable. It exhibits the same characteristics as the collectanea of *Kṛṣṇa-stotras* mentioned above, and its evidence cannot carry us any further than they do. The manuscript is fragmentary, but the work must have been a fairly big collection numbering a total of 212 verses, while the colophon *viṣṇor bāla-krīḍā samāptā* makes it plausible that, like the *Bāla-gopāla-stuti* mentioned above, it may have formed a section of a larger collection dealing also with other aspects of *Viṣṇu-līlā*. Of the verses that are available in the existing folios, sixty-three can be traced to the Second and Third Āśvāsas (but not in the same order), and none in the First Āśvāsa; while as many as thirteen verses are independently given. We have, in the same way, sixty-three and fifty-six verses respectively of the *Kṛṣṇa-stotra* and *Bilvamaṅgala-kośa-kāvya* traceable in the Second and Third Āśvāsas (but not in the same order) and none in the First Āśvāsa; while a large number of verses is given independently. All these facts indicate that the *Viṣṇu-stuti* is not "really a version of the well known *Kṛṣṇa-karṇāmṛta*," as Mr. Narahari misunderstands it to be, but it is, like the Kṛṣṇaite verse-collections mentioned above, one of the many sources which went into the making of the Second and Third Āśvāsa of the South Indian recension; and its evidence is relevant only to that extent.

Much has been made of the date 1418 A.D. of the manuscript of the *Viṣṇu-stuti*. But this date does not prove that the Second and Third Āśvāsas of the *Kṛṣṇa-karṇāmṛta* existed before it, but only confirms that such independent collections existed at that date and supplied the material for the making of these later Āśvāsas. Its connexion with Caitanya's discovery of the *Kṛṣṇa-karṇāmṛta*, therefore, need not be misconceived. The date makes it possible for Caitanya to have found such works as the *Viṣṇu-stuti*, but it does not prove, without begging the question, that Caitanya could have found the Second and Third Āśvāsas already made up from such collections of *Kṛṣṇa-stotras*.

In Mr. Narahari's further article on the date of the *Kṛṣṇa-karṇāmṛta* in *IHQ*., xx, 1944, pp. 86-87, as well as in this article, the learned writer refers to this Adyar Library Manuscript dated 1418, but his assumption that it is a manuscript of the *Kṛṣṇa-karṇāmṛta* similarly vitiates his arguments based upon its evidence.

S. K. DE

Vajraṭa

I.

A passage occurring in several copper-plate charters of the Rāṣṭrakūṭa kings of Malkhed mentions a certain Vajraṭa among the enemies defeated by the Cāḷukyas of Bādāmi whom Dantidurga the founder of the dynasty had overthrown. He is said to have vanquished with a handful of followers, the countless forces of Karṇāṭaka, which had proved their efficiency by inflicting crushing defeats on the lord of Kāñcī, the king of Keraḷa, the Coḷa, the Pāṇḍya, Śrī Harṣa and Vajraṭa.[1] Though nothing more is known about this Vajraṭa, the following deductions can be made with justification:—

(1) that Vajraṭa like Śrī Harṣa and unlike Kāñcīśa, Keraḷa-narādhipa, Coḷa, and Pāṇḍya is a personal name;

(2) that he was not the ruler of any one of the four South Indian kingdoms mentioned in the passage, as his name is placed in juxtaposition to them;

(3) that he was perhaps as great and as powerful as Śrī Harṣa inasmuch as his name was considered worthy enough to be coupled with the latter.

and (4) that he possibly flourished subsequent to the time of Śrī Harṣa since his name is mentioned in the passage after that of Harṣa.

The enemies of the Cāḷukyas of Bādāmi enumerated in the passage under consideration may be grouped into three classes according to their habitat. The ruler of Kāñcī, the king of Keraḷa, the Coḷa and the Pāṇḍya may be included in one class, as all of them belonged to the south. Śrī Harṣa must be taken to constitute a class by himself, as he was a North Indian monarch. Vajraṭa whose habitat is not known must be considered separately.

1 *EI*., VI, No. 18, pp. 210-2.

काञ्चीश-केरलनराधिप-चोल-पाराड्य श्रीहर्ष-वज्रट-विभेद-विधान-दक्षम् ।
कर्णाटकं बलमनन्तमजेयमन्यै-भृत्यैः कियद्भिरपि यः सहसा जिगाम ॥

The dominions of the Cāḷukyas of Bādāmi extended in the west as far as the Arabian Sea, since the days of Kīrtivarman I who appears to have been the real founder of the kingdom. It embraced the whole of Teliṅgāṇa including Veṅgī and Kaliṅga in the east since the time of its conquest in the first half of the 7th century A.D. The names of the Viṣṇukuṇḍin and the Eastern Gaṅga kings who ruled on the east coast before the Cāḷukyan conquest are known; and no prince of the name of Vajraṭa is known to have belonged to any of these dynasties. The probability therefore seems to be that Vajraṭa was not a ruler of South India or Deccan and that he, like Śrī Harṣa. with whom he is associated in the Rāṣṭrakūṭa charters, was a North Indian monarch.

II.

It has been suggested above that Vajraṭa probably flourished in the period which followed the death of Śrī Harṣa. The evidence of the inscriptions of the Cāḷukyas of Bādāmi seems to lend colour to the suggestion. If Vajraṭa, as stated already, were really a ruler of North India, it is not unlikely that he would have come into conflict with the kings of Bādāmi on one of the occasions when they invaded North India. An examination of the records issued by them reveals the fact that during the period of their rule they waged war on the North Indian kings, but thrice. Maṅgalīśa was the first king of Bādāmi to turn his attention towards the affairs of the North.[2] Maṅgalīśa, who succeeded his elder brother, came very early in his reign into conflict with the powerful Kalaccuri or Kaṭaccuri king, Buddharāja. whose sway extended over a large part of Western India and the Gangetic basin. The cause of the conflict appears to have been incompatible territorial ambitions, which resulted ultimately in the outbreak of hostilities. In the war that ensued Buddharāja was worsted, and Maṅgalīśa captured all his wealth, and although desirous of setting up a pillar of victory on the banks of the Bhāgīrathī, he returned to his own kingdom to erect there at first a *dharmajayastambha*.[3] It is not known whether Maṅgalīśa ever fulfilled his desire of erecting a *jayastambha* on the banks of the Bhāgīrathī, as nothing more is said about it in his inscriptions.

2 The Mahākūṭa Pillar Inscription (*IA.*, XIX, p. 18) no doubt attributes to Kīrtivarman I the conquest of several countries in North-eastern India such as Aṅga. Vaṅga, Magadha, etc., but it is doubtful whether he could have undertaken the conquest of countries which lay far away to the north-east of his kingdom. (Cf. *Dyn. Kan. Dist.*, p. 346).

3 *IA.*, XIX, p. 18.

The Cāḷukyas of Bādāmi came into clash once again during the reign of Maṅgalīśa's nephew and successor, Pulakeśin II. Śrī Harṣa of Kanauj who brought the whole of Northern India under his sway invaded the Deccan with the object of imposing his yoke on the peoples of the south, and Pulakeśin II who by that time succeeded in making himself the master of the Peninsula opposed him on the banks of the Revā and barred the passage of his army across the river.[4] A fierce engagement took place and Harṣa being defeated on the battle-field beat a retreat into his own dominions, and did not again repeat the attempt during the remaining years of his reign.

The Cāḷukyas of Bādāmi were involved for the third time in a war with a North Indian power during the reign of Vikramāditya I, the son and successor of Pulakeśin II. Two important passages occurring in the inscriptions of Vijayāditya Satyāśraya, the grandson of Vikramāditya I. give a brief account of the main incidents of this war.

"सकलोत्तरापथनाथ मथनोपार्ज्जित पालिर्ध्वजादि समस्तपारमैश्वर्य्यचिह्नस्य-विनयादित्य सत्याश्रय श्रीपृथिवीवल्लभ-महाराजाधिराज-परमेश्वर भट्टारकः।"

"दक्षिणाशाविजयिनि पितामहे समुन्मुलित-निखिल-कण्टकसंहतिरुत्तरापथ-विजिगीषोर्ग्गुरोर्ग्रत एवाहव-व्यापारमचरन्नरातिगजघटापाटन-विशिर्य्यमाणकृपाणधारः समग्रविग्रहग्रेसरःसत्साहसरसिकः।"[5]

According to these passages, Vinayāditya-Satyāśraya crushed (in battle) the lord of the entire Uttarāpatha (i.e. Northern India) and wrested from him the *Pālidhvaja* and the other insignia of paramount sovereignty; and his son Vijayāditya Satyāśraya. while his gradfather Vikramāditya I was engaged in the destruction of enemies during his expedition of the conquest of the southern region, accompanied his own father Vinayāditya Satyāśraya who led his armies for the conquest of the region of the north, and fighting in the van of the forces under the eyes of his father defeated the enemies and acquired for him the symbols of the rivers Gaṅgā and Yamunā, the *Pālidhvaja*, the drums *paṭaha* and *ḍhakka* and the (five) great musical instruments. It is believed that this expedition to Northern India took place during the reign of Vinayāditya and that the *Pālidhvaja* was acquired during the course of the expedition, twice, once by Vinayāditya himself and again by his son Vijayāditya who pushed on further to the

4 *EI.*, VI, p. 6.

5 *IA.*, IX, pp. 127-8.

north even than his father.[6] Vinayāditya's expedition to Northern India, it must be pointed out, did not take place during his own reign but that of his father Vikramāditya I, when he was directing the affairs of the state as *yuvarāja*. This is made quite clear by the opening words दक्षिणाशाविजयिनि पितामह of the second passage cited above which are in the locative case; they indicate that the events described in the rest of the passage took place during the progress of the act contemplated by them. It is therefore certain that the expedition to Northern India led by Vinayāditya and his son took place not during the reign of the former but that of his father, Vikramāditya I. The capture of the *Pālidhvaja* mentioned in the passage under consideration refers to one and the same incident. Vijayāditya acting under the command of his father marched in advance of him and seized from the enemy his *Pālidhvaja* banner. Although Vijayāditya was the actual agent through whom the capture of the *Pālidhvaja* was effected, the credit of taking the banner belongs to Vinayāditya himself. There is therefore no need to suppose that the *Pālidhvaja* was captured on two different occasions. This incident is mentioned twice in the same charter, because the part played by the mediate and immediate agents of the act are described therein separately. Another incident in the career of Vijayāditya which is believed to have taken place during the northern expedition may be noticed here with advantage. A passage which is found in all his inscriptions states that on one occasion while pursuing the fleeing enemy he fell into their hands and was made prisoner, however, he managed to escape without assistance, and restore the tranquillity in his ancestral territories which were plunged in anarchy.[7] There is reason to believe that this incident happened not during the northern invasion as it is generally believed, but in the war with the Pallavas, who, during the absence of himself and his father in Northern India, inflicted a crushing defeat on his grandfather, and captured the capital of his ancestral kingdom, Vātāi.[8] It must be pointed out that at the time of Vijayāditya's captivity, his grandfather was still ruling; and his father was associated with him in the administration of the kingdom as *yuvarāja*. Vijayāditya was then only a junior prince. There is no

6 Fleet, *Dyn. Kan. Dist.*, p. 368.

7 *IA.*, IX, pp. 127-8. परैः पलायमानैरासाद्य कथमपि विधिवशादपनीतोऽपि प्रतापादेव विषयप्रकोपमराजकमुत्सार्यैन् वत्सराजयिवानपेक्षितापर-साहायस्तदवग्रहन्निर्गत्य ।

8 *Madras Christian College Magazine*, Oct. 1927.

reason, under the circumstances, why, because of his captivity in the north, his ancestral kingdom should have lapsed into anarchy. The anarchy was caused, as a matter of fact, not by his captivity, but, as stated above, by the Pallava invasion. This is made quite evident by the inscriptions of Vinayāditya, where it is said that he, by the command of his father, checked the advance of the powerful Trairājya-Pallava and restored tranquillity to his kingdom.[9] As Vijayāditya's northern campaign was conducted during the time of Vikramāditya's *dakṣiṇ-āśā-vijaya,* and as the Pallava invasion which almost caused the disruption of the Cāḷukya kingdom took place immediately after it, Vijayāditya's captivity, and the subsequent pacification of the kingdom must be associated with the Pallava invasion.

III

The foregoing analysis of the relations of the Cāḷukyas of Bādāmi with the Northern Indian powers shows that they were involved in a war on three different occasions:—

(i) Maṅgaḷeśa waged war on the Kaḷaccuri king Buddharāja, son of Saṅkaragaṇa, whose kingdom extended, perhaps, as far as the Ganges.

(ii) Pulakeśin II opposed the advance of Śrī Harṣa of Kanauj, the lord paramount of the entire Northern India and defeated him on the banks of the Revā.

(iii) Vikramāditya I sent an expedition to Northern India under his son, Vinayāditya; the latter, who was assisted in conducting the campaign by his son Vijayāditya, defeated some paramount sovereign of the north and wrested from him his insignia.

The name of the northern enemy who suffered defeat at the hands of the Cāḷukyas on the first two occasions are definitely known. Nothing definite, however, is said about the enemy whom they vanquished on the third occasion. Two important facts however, may be noted. He was, in the first place, a *Sakal-ottar-ādhipati,* the paramount sovereign of Northern India. As the Cāḷukyas are said to have seized from him in consequence of a victory over him, the Gaṅgā and the Yamunā, besides other emblems of

9 *IA.*, VI, p. 89. पितुराज्ञया बालेन्दु-शेखरस्येव सेनानिर्दैत्यबलमतिसमुद्धतं त्रैराज्य-पल्लवबलमवस्टभ्य समस्तविषयप्रशमनाद्विहित-तन्मनोऽनुरञ्जनः ।

royalty, it is not unlikely that he was the master of the doab between these two rivers. Secondly, as the northern expedition under Vinayāditya and Vijayāditya was conducted during Vikramāditya's conquest of the southern region, which, as shown by his Gadwal Plates, took place in A.D. 674,[10] the *Sakal-ottar-ādhipati* from whom they wrested his insignia must have also suffered defeat in the same year.

Who this *Sakal-ottar-ādhipati* was, it is difficult to say. He was in all probability the Vajraṭa mentioned in the Rāṣṭrakūṭa records, as surmised long ago by Dr. Fleet.[11] If the Cālukyas of Bādāmi had ever defeated a a king called Vajraṭa, they must have done so during the northern expedition of Vinayāditya and his son. The history of Northern India in the years immediately following the death of Śrī Harṣa is obscure, and very little is known about the events which happened during this period. Nevertheless, a few facts gleaned from literary sources point out to the rule, at Kanauj, of a king called Vajrāyudha some time before the advent of the Gūrjara Pratīhāras. The poet Rājaśekhara, who flourished in the court of Mahendrapāla of Kanauj, refers incidentally in his *Karpūramañjarī* to the king Vajrāyudha who ruled over Pāñcāla with his capital at Kanauj.[12] Though nothing is known about this king, Dr. R. S. Tripathi persumes that he belonged to the same family as Indrāyudha and Cakrāyudha whom he designates as the Āyudhas; and that he must have ascended the throne sometime about A.D. 770, since the Jaina *Harivaṃśa* informs us that a king named Indrāyudha was ruling in Kanauj in the year 783-84 A.D., while we also know from other sources that he was succeeded by Cakrāyudha.[13] The term 'Āyudhas' may be accepted as a convenient designation to refer to this line of kings; but the chronology adopted by Dr. Tripathi is by no means reasonable. Because two kings with names ending in 'āyudha' ruled at Kanauj one after another, before the establishment of the Gūrjara Pratīhāra power, it does not necessarily follow that another king with the same name-ending preceded them immediately. It is just possible that he may have ruled much earlier.

The *Mañjuśrīmūlaklapa*, a chronicle which is supposed to have been written in the 8th century, A.D., gives a brief account of a king of Northern

10 *EI.*, X, p. 101.
11 *Dyn. Kan. Dist.*, p. 368.
12 *Karpūramañjarī*, III, 5.
13 *History of Kanauj*, pp. 212-13.

India whose name begins with the letter '*Va*'.[14] He was a paramount soverign and a great conqueror:—

"His (Rājyavardhana's) descendant (*anuja*, heir, born after him) will be Dha (rasena IV), a Kṣatriya (by caste), fond of *dharma* (Buddhism). He will be king for three years. Then, the youngest (in) his (family) will be king, the famous V (T. *MMK*. j). He will be over the whole country an all-India emperor (*sārva-bhūmika-bhūpatiḥ*). He will possess (an army of) elephants, and chariots, and navy, everywhere.

"He will conquer every enemy. He will decorate the whole empire with Buddha images, monasteries, and relic memorials. His original ancestry was Dvijāti Śākya (Ikṣvāku).

"He was self-respecting, sharp, wise, humble, on account of the Buddhist wisdom, with sense of honour, and in that low age attained happiness. He lives with care 100 years and 5 (days)."[15]

Rājyavardhana mentioned in this passage is no doubt the elder brother and predecessor of the emperor Harṣa. Commenting on this passage, Jayaswal observes, "It is a very important datum that after Rājyavardhana (that is, his house), the next emperor noted is Dha (rasena IV; 646-649 A.D.). He is called a descendant of (the family of) Rājyavardhana, evidently for the

14 *Mañjuśrimūlakalpa* like the much later *Vidyāraṇya-kālajñāna* refers to kings whose history it purports to describe only by the initial letter of their names.

15 K. P. Jayaswal's translations: *Imperial History of India*, p. 66.

तेऽनुपूर्वेण धर्मात्मानो प्रत्येकां वोधिमाप्नुयात्
तस्याप्यनुजोधकाराख्यः क्षत्रियो धर्मवत्सलः ॥
भविता सोऽपि रजा वै त्रोणि वर्षाणि भविता असौ नराधिपः
तस्यपि कन्यसो राज वकाराख्योऽथ विश्रुतः
भविता तत्र देशोऽस्मि सार्वभूमिक भूपतिः ॥
हस्त्यश्वरथयानानि नौयानानि समन्ततः
जेता रिपूणां सर्वेषां समरे प्रत्युपस्थिताम् ॥
स इमां जनपदां सर्वं कृत्स्नां यैव वसुन्धराम्
शास्तुविम्वै विहारैश्च जिनानां धातुधरैस्तथा ॥
शोभाप्यति सर्वा वै कृत्स्नां यैव वसुन्धराम्
नृप पूर्वा तथा तस्य द्विजातिः शाक्यजस्तथा

*　　*　　*

क्षत्रियः अग्रधोः प्रोक्तः राजा वै धर्मवत्सलः
जीवेद्वर्षं शतं विंशत सप्त चाष्टं च यत्नतः ॥ *Ibid.*, Text, p. 63.

reason that he was the grandson and heir of Harṣavardhana. His empire is described and one more member of the latter's family V (?) is noted as the last emperor in this history. They are noted as all-India emperors."[16]

Though one may not feel inclined to accept what all Jayaswal says in this context, it must be admitted that the *Mañjuśrīmūlakalpa* preserves a genuine tradition of the rule in North India after Harṣa of a line of paramount sovereigns, connected somehow with the Vardhana family. It is not unlikely that V, the initial letter of the name of the last ruler of the line stands for Vajraṭa; and in that case he might have been the *sakal-ottar-ādhipati,* whom Vinayāditya and his son defeated and appropriated the *Pālidhvaja,* and the emblems of the Gaṅgā and the Yamunā which constituted the insignia of his sovereignty.

N. VENKATARAMANAYYA

Rāmabhadras of Bengal

Materials for a history of Sanskrit literature of Bengal are mostly lying hidden in the large number of public and private Mss. libraries of Bengal and elsewhere. The results of the first great spade work in the field of Smṛti and Navyanyāya were published by the late Mr. M. Chakravarti about 30 years ago and subsequently Mm. Gopinātha Kavirāja made further remarkable progress in the Nyāya-Vaiśeṣika.[1] Enormous work remains yet to be undertaken on the subject and we welcome Mr. S. C. Banerji's notes on the three Rāmabhadras of Bengal (*IHQ.*, XIX, pp. 330-43), which, however, seem to have succeeded in making confusion worse confounded. We shall try very briefly to lift a few veils of confusion.

Rāmabhadra Nyāyālaṅkāra

His *Dāyabhāgaṭīkā* is long available in print. This work, it should be noted, contains not a single reference either to Raghunandana or to Acyuta.[2]

16 Jayaswal, *Imperial History of India,* pp. 59-60.

1 *JASB.*, 1915, pp. 259-92, 311-75. Sarasvati Bhavana Studies, vols. IV, V.

2 Chakravarti points out (*JASB.*, 1915, p. 349 fn.) that under Dāyabhāga I. 55 (p. 89) Rāmabhadra defends his father against an attack of Acyuta. This is an oversight. Rāmabhadra, as a matter of fact, does not attempt to reply to the criticisms of Acyuta here or elsewhere.

The *Smṛtisaṅgraha*,[3] on the other hand, as Mr. Banerji has shown (pp. 332-4), not only freely cited from the works of Raghunandana, sometimes under the admiring epithet 'Smārta Bhaṭṭācārya,' but occasionally recorded the views of 'Navyāḥ' and in one place (towards the end of the section on *Śuddhi*) of both 'Navyāḥ' and 'Atinavīnāḥ' upon those of Raghunandana etc. As a son of Śrīnātha, who preceded both Govindānanda and Haridāsa Tarkācārya,[4] Rāmabhadra cannot be brought down to the 17th century A.D. It is wrong, therefore, to identify him with the author of the *Smṛtisaṅgraha*, who flourished about a century later in the 17th century at the earliest. It escaped the notice of Mr. Banerji that in the *Smṛtisaṅgraha* (Ācārya-) Cūḍāmaṇi is frequently cited and often criticised, but never under the reverential epithet 'Guravaḥ' so conspicuous in the *Dāyabhāgaṭīkā*. There is no necessity, therefore, of revising the opinion of Aufrecht (*Cat. Cat.*, I.

3 The same or a similar work is ascribed to one Mahāmahopādhyāya Cintāmaṇi Nyāyavāgīśa (L. 1550—Ms. dated 1610 Śaka) or Nyāyālaṅkāra (L. 1580—Ms. of 1611 Śaka). An anonymous work of the same nature named *Śuddhyādi-saṅgraha* (L. 1539—Ms. dated 1733 Śaka) begins with the invocation:—

व्रजशिशुवृन्दवयस्यं सततमुपास्यं विरिञ्चयादेः ।
वेदाविदितरहस्यं गिरिशनमस्यं नमस्यामः ॥

This verse occurs at the beginning of some of the works of the great polymath Rāmanātha Vidyāvācaspati e.g. Cal. Sans. Coll. Ms. (Smṛti, p. 149) of दायभागविवेक. Another similar anonymous work named 'Mūrkhahā' is available in Mss. (*Desc. Cat., Sans. Coll.*, Calcutta, Smṛti part, p. 105). So the ascription to Rāmabhadra is problematic, though the volume of evidence is much greater in his favour. In a slip of notes dated 1209 B.S. (1801 A.D.), we examined at Navadvipa, the work is referred to as Rāmabhadrī-saṅgraha.

4 Govindānanda frequently refers to Śrīnātha in most of his works as 'Ādhunikāḥ.' In the *Śuddhikaumudī* (p. 270) several intercalary months are cited, the last one being the month Śrāvaṇa of 1457 Śaka (1535 A.D.). In his commentary on the *Śrāddhaviveka* (Vaṅgīya Sāhitya Pariṣad Ms. No. 202, fol. 62a) he refers to the 'kṣayamāsa' of 1462 Śaka (1540 A.D.) as an event not yet past. On the other hand his father Gaṇapati Bhaṭṭa wrote a work on Jyotiṣa named *Jyotiṣmatī* in 4613 K.E. (1512 A.D.). His commentary on the *Śrāddhaviveka* is an improvement upon that of Haridāsa Tarkācārya who wrote between 1505-20 A.D. (*IHQ.*, XVI. p. 61). The latter again criticised the views of Śrīnātha as an examination of their respective commentaries on the *Śrāddhaviveka* has shown. Śrīnātha, therefore, wrote most of his works before 1510 A.D. Raghunandana is a comparatively recent writer. He has named Govindānanda in the *Rāsayātrātattva* (vide *Prācyavāṇi*, I, p. 21-2) and must have written the *Tattvas* between 1550 and 1575 A.D. No writer, therefore, who refers to him by name can be placed before the 17th cent. A.D.

p. 517), who differentiated the son of Śrīnātha from all other Rāmabhadras. The author of the *Vidvanmodinī* (L. 2505) was more likely different from both the above Smārta writers as well as from another Rāmabhadra Nyāyālaṅkāra (son of Raghunātha) who wrote a commentary on the *Mugdhabodha* after Durgādāsa of 1639 A.D. (*I.O. Cat.*, I., p. 234-5). The father of the Tantrik writer Rāmeśvara (L. 260) and grandfather[5] of Raghumaṇi (Vidyābhuṣaṇa), author of the *Āgamasāra* (L. 263), was wrongly identified with the son of Śrīnātha in the local history of Navadvīpa (*Navadvīpa-mahimā*, Ist ed., p. 124, 2nd ed., p. 199) and the error has been repeated by all later writers on the subject. This Rāmabhadra Nyāyālaṅkāra was the spiritual preceptor of Rājā Kṛṣṇacandra of Navadvīpa as clearly stated by his grandson Raghumaṇi Vidyābhūṣaṇa (d. 1819 A.D.) in the lexicon *Prāṇakṛṣṇīya-Śabdābdhi* written in 1737 Ś. (1815 A.D.) under the patronage of the famous Prāṇakṛṣṅa Viśvāsa of Khardaha and printed in *Puthi* form (No. of fol. 171). This distinguished family survives in several villages of Nadia near about Navadvīpa and Rāmabhadra was an inhabitant not exactly of Navadvīpa but of Vāhirgāchi. His second son was Rāmeśvara Tarkavāgīśa.

Rāmabhadra Sārvabhauma

As long ago as 1884 A.D. Bhandarkar[6] noticed a Ms. of the *Nyāyarahasya* by Rāmabhadra Sārvabhauma, *son of Bhaṭṭācārya-Cūḍāmaṇi*, and correctly surmised that 'this person was in all probability the same as Jānakīnātha Bhaṭṭācāryacūḍāmaṇi, author of the *Nyāyasiddhāntamañjarī*.' Let us cite the second verse at the beginning of the *Nyāyarahasya* (*B.O.R.I.*, Ms. No. 743 of 1882-83):—

5 In the descriptive note of R. L. Mitra on the *Āgamasāra* it is nowhere stated that the name of the sixth son of Rāmabhadra Nyāyālaṅkāra was Raghumaṇi; the verse under question was left incomplete. On the evidence of Raghumaṇi's another printed work cited below, the *Prāṇakṛṣṇīya-Śabdābdhi*, the name of this son of Rāmabhadra was Rāmānanda Vidyālaṅkāra, whose eldest son was Raghumaṇi Vidyābhūṣaṇa:—

न्यायालङ्कारवेद्योऽजनि कुमुदनये रामभद्रेतिनामा
यस्यासीत् कृष्णचन्द्रः क्षितिपतिरतुलः शिष्य आज्ञानुशास्यः ।
रामानन्देतिनामाजनि जननतस्ततसुतो यः कनीयान्
विद्यालङ्कारवेद्यः कृतविविधपुरश्चर्य्य आश्चर्य्यरूपः ॥

6 *Report* on the Search for Sans. Mss. in the Bombay Presidency during 1882-83, p. 21.

आराध्यानादिमूर्तेरखिलसुरगुरोः शङ्करस्याङ्घ्रिपद्म
मग्नान् मोहान्धकारे तपन इव मुनिः प्राणिनः प्रोद्दिधीर्षुः ।
अत्ताङ्घ्रिः शास्त्रमेतत् परमकरुणया यद्वयधात्तद्रहस्यं
श्रीभट्टाचार्य्यचूडामणितनय इदं रामभद्रस्तनोति ॥

Without consulting this statement of Bhandarkar the local historian of Navadvīpa also correctly recorded that Rāmabhadra was the son of Jānakīnātha (*Navadvīpa-mahimā,* 2nd ed., 1344 B.E., p. 148). The age-old confusion (cf. *Navadvīpa-mahimā,* 1st ed., 1298 B.E., pp. 63-4) about the 'Bhavānī-Bhavanāthābhyām' verse at the beginning of the *Kusumāñjali-vyākhyā* of Rāmabhadra has long been satisfactorily explained by Mm. Gopinātha Kavirāja on the strength of a rare Ms. viz. it is a medley of two distinct works, an earlier incomplete work of Śaṅkara Miśra[7] supplemented by Rāmabhadra at a later date.[8] In blissful ignorance of all these facts Mr. Banerji steps in with his astounding theory that Rāmabhadra was a son of Raghunātha Śiromaṇi and a pupil of Śrīnātha!! It is, on the face of it, absurd that one of the greatest Naiyāyikas of the age would take lessons on dialectics from an orthodox Smārta, whose feelings against the dialecticians are freely expressed in the beginning of the *Tithivivekaṭīkā:*—

गजनिमीलनवत्तु मनश्चिरं दधति दर्शनतत्त्वविदः स्मृतौ ।
पदपदार्थविचारजडाः परे तदिह शिष्यहिताय मम श्रमः ॥

Mr. Banerji has taken his perilous stand in the matter on the *lacuna* of the D. U. Ms. of the *Guṇarahasya* and on an impossible interpretation of the well known verse तातस्य तर्कसरसीरुहकाननेषु &c.' found both in the *Padārthakhaṇḍanaṭīkā* and *Nañvādaṭīkā* of Rāmabhadra. The *Guṇarahasya* is not altogether an unobtainable work; the first half of the second verse at the beginning reads (we quote from a Ms. in our own possession):— **चूडामणेस्तार्किकाणां पुत्रैर्गु**णरहस्यकम् । Hall's confusion that Rāmabhadra was a son of Raghunātha Śiromaṇi arose from a misreading in a passage of the *Padārthakhaṇḍanaṭīkā* viz. न चापसिद्धान्तः प्रमेयवार्त्तिके स्फुटत्वादिति **शब्दमणिदीधितौ** तातचरणाः । (Benares ed., 1916, p. 118). We have been able to trace the correct reading **शब्दमणिमरीचौ** in several old Mss.[9] The *Maṇimarīci* is a

7 It is strange Mr. Banerji does not know that Śaṅkara Miśra acknowledges his pupilage under his father Bhavanātha in almost all his works e.g. *Vādivinoda, Līlāvatīkaṇṭhābharaṇa, Vaiśeṣika-Sūtropaskāra.*

8 Introd. to Varadarāja's *Kusumāñjalibodhanī* (Sarasvatī-Bhavana Text) 1922, p. ii-iii fn.

9 An old Ms. belonging to Pandit Yatīndranātha Tarkatīrtha of Navadvīpa,

lost work of Jānakīnātha cited by him in the *Nyāyasiddhāntamañjarī* (Benares ed., p. 18). Moreover, one passage cited by Rāmabhadra as from his father "तातचरणास्तु-प्रामाणिकत्वादियमनवस्था न दोषाय इति अतिरिक्ता एव भेदा-भेदाः···इत्याहुः। (*Padārthakhaṇḍanaṭīkā*, p. 109) is actually traceable in the work of Jānakīnātha (p. 47). Mr. Banerji's interpretation of the marginal superscript "Rāmabhadrī Kusu Pā" (p. 341) is wholly wrong. '*Pātrās*' are not abridged editions of larger treatises but advanced notes on difficult passages of the various texts, which used to be the delight of former dialecticians. They are mostly anonymous as the few leaves found by Mr. Banerji. The *Kusumāñjalivyākhyā* of both Haridāsa and Rāmabhadra at one time formed subjects of studies in the seminaries and these '*pātrās*' are notes of debate on them by some recent scholar.

Rāmabhadra Siddhāntavāgīśa was a grandson of Jagadīśa Tarkālaṅkāra, whose descendants survive at Navadvīpa. (*Navadvīpa-mahimā*, 1st ed., p. 79).

DINESH CHANDRA BHATTACHARYYA

a direct descendant of Jagadīśa Tarkālaṅkāra, reads मरीचौ (fol. 13b); also a Ms. in our possession (fol. 15b). The Calcutta Sans. Coll. Ms. No. 183 dated in 1670 V.S. reads here शब्दमणिदीधितौ (fol. 20b), but this wrong reading is found corrected in the margin as मरीचौ.

REVIEWS

JÑĀNA-DĪPIKĀ, a commentary by Devabodha on the Ādi-parvan of the *Mahābhārata*, edited by R. N. Dandekar. Ph.D. Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona 1941.

The *Jñāna-dīpikā Mahābhārata-tātparya-ṭīkā* of Devabodha is our oldest known commentary on the *Mahābhārata*, that of Nīlakaṇṭha being one of the latest. It was Sukthankar who for the first time correctly appreciated its importance and utilised its evidence. both positive and negative, as a valuable testimonium for the constitution of the critical text of the Epic. This importance results partly from its antiquity (for Devabodha should be placed earlier than 1150 A.D.) and partly from the fact that it follows a superior (as Nīlakaṇṭha follows an inferior) text-tradition of the Epic. Unfortunately, however, manuscripts of Devabodha's commentary are extremely rare, and obtainable only in fragments and on some of the individual Parvans. So far, it is available for Ādi, Sabhā, Udyoga, Bhīṣma and Droṇa. It is a happy idea, therefore, to recover and edit the text, and Professor Dandekar has now given us an authentic edition of the Ādi-parvan commentary. It is based upon three Devanāgarī Paper manuscripts, but the manuscript material does not appear to be as satisfactory as one would wish it to be. In spite of this difficulty, the text is carefully edited with full critical apparatus and references. One would only wish that the editor had given us some idea of the general character of the commentary itself and of the particular text-tradition followed by it in the Ādi-parvan.

SUKTHANKAR MEMORIAL EDITION. VOLUME I: CRITICAL STUDIES IN THE MAHĀBHĀRATA by Vishnu Sitaram Sukthankar. Edited, on behalf of the Memorial Edition Committee, by P. K. Gode. Karnatak Publishing House, Bombay, 21st January 1944. Royal Octavo, Pp. xii, 440.

BULLETIN OF THE DECCAN COLLEGE RESEARCH INSTITUTE, Vol. V: V. S. SUKTHANKAR MEMORIAL VOLUME. Edited by V. M. Apte and H. D. Sankalia. Poona, 21st January 1944. Royal Octavo, Pp. lvi, 329.

These two imporatnt volumes, published from two well known Institutions on the first anniversary of Sukthankar's sad and sudden death, bear eloquent testimony to the warm affection and esteem with which the great scholar was regarded by his colleagues, friends and admirers. The genesis of the first of these publications is well known to the world of oriental scholars. Immediately after the passing of Sukthankar, a Committee was set up, which proposed publishing a memorial edition of his collected works in two volumes, and issued an appeal for support of the idea. After a hearty and spontaneous response to the appeal, the project was earnestly taken up; but the main responsibility of bringing it to fruition devolved upon that enterprising and enthusiastic scholar, P. K. Gode, of the Bhandarkar Institute, who had been associated with Sukthankar for many years at Poona. In these days of difficulty, it speaks a great deal for his zeal that the first volume of the Memorial Edition could be completed within less than a year and presented to the annivertsary memorial meeting held at Poona on January 21, 1944.

The first volume now published contains all the writings of Sukthankar on the *Mahābhārata* and its text-critical and text-historical problems, including the famous Prolegomena affixed to his Critical Edition of the Ādi-parvan, the series of his eight Epic Studies and two Epic Questions. Of these, the Prolegomena has been rightly characterised as forming the bed-rock of Mahābhārata Textual Criticism; for it gives for the first time a brilliant exposition of the entire text-problem of the *Mahābhārata* in the light of the author's long and intensive experience, and clarifies the principal issues, as well the method and principle of text-reconstruction, not *a priori,* but by means of a direct and thorough study of the complicated text-tradition of the Epic.[1] Sukthankar rightly emphasises that the *Mahābhārata* text-problem is a problem *sui juris*. As the text-tradition in India differs vastly from that of Europe, Sukthankar rightly maintains that the genetic method, which is usually applied to the case of ordinary classical texts, cannot be clearly and consistently applied here to a notoriously fluid and uncertain text, and that the principles of Mahābhārata text-reconstruction must be evolved independently by an intensive study of the data furnished by its own material and tradition. Besides the normal vicissitudes of oral and

1 For a review by the present writer of the text-critical principles enunciated in the Prolegomena, see *IHQ*., xi, 1935, pp. 597-603.

written transmission, we have in the case of the Mahābhārata text certain abnormal circumstances of transmission, which have not only produced a bewildering confusion of versions, localised in as many scripts as there are provinces in India, but have also created, by mutual contamination, amazing fusion of versions and types, each of which has a complicated history behind it. By means of hundreds of real variants systematically digested in the elaborate critical apparatus, which occupies nearly two-thirds of the space of the Poona Critical Edition, it has been possible to establish definitely that the epic text, at all stages of its history and even after scriptal fixation, was extremely unstable and carelessly guarded, and afforded easy opportunities of all kinds of diakeustic activity, not only of ignorant scribes but also of a host of scholars, pets and reciters, who wanted to bring the living and growing text in a line with the progressive life of the nation, with the changing ideas of essentially different ages and localities. The problem is, thus, not merely one of neat additions and omissions, for these can be, more or less, easily separated by a comparison of different manuscripts and by tracing them all to an original archetype. Nor is it a question of merely correcting obvious misreadings, scribal mistakes or inevitable corruptions of a fixed written archetype; because only a small percentage of the hundreds of variants are really graphical or careless errors, they are mostly genuine variants from the point of view of language and sense. It thus appears that each version, and even each manuscript or group of manuscripts, was an independent copy of divergently transmitted texts, which, in addition to being subjected to the normal process of accretions, omissions or alterations, must have become strangely contaminated with each other by means of free comparison, extensive mutual borrowing and an indiscriminate tendency to include rather than to exclude. It is clear, therefore, that the Śatasāhasrī, as a dynamic text, can hardly be made to conform statically to a rigid archetype. The text-tradition was never simple and uniform, but was multiple and polygenous; and in the long chain of successive revisional and amplificatory activities it is now almost impossible to discover the elusive lost original. Like the Indian Nyagrodha, to quote the fine simile used by Sukthankar, it has spread far and wide a complicated system of varied and intertwined growths until the main stem is lost in the astonishing maze of growing diversity. How then is it possible to unify the diversity of recensions, the plurality of versions and the endless multiplicity of sub-groups, and evolve and justify a form of the text out of the tangled complexities of

the fluctuating mass of materials? Sukthankar demonstrates, with a rare mastery of details and grasp of fundamentals, that the text-problem cannot be properly solved by any *a priori* method or principle, but by such as can be deduced by a critical and comparative study of the text-evolution as revealed by the manuscripts themselves. The Prolegomena, therefore, proceeds, on this basis, to evaluate the different recensions and versions and determine their mutual relation as recensions and versions. Then it considers, on the same basis, the essential principles, comparative and critical, and the method of text-reconstruction, which can be deduced, by a strictly scientific and objective approach, from a direct study of the epic text-tradition. It is, thus, clear that the Prolegomena is valuable not only for the merit of fixing the fundamental principles of Mahābhārata Textual Criticism, but it is also a brilliant and enduring contribution to Indian Textual Methodology in general.

The first four of the series of Sukthankar's eight Epic Studies consist generally of detailed text-critical notes necessitated by the misunderstanding of some critics of his method and principles. They partly anticipate and partly amplify in detail some of the general principles so precisely summed up some years later in the Prolegomena, but they also contain much that is not found there or only briefly dealt with. The fifth number of the Epic Studies deals with the relative chronology of the more important commentators on the Mahābhārata. It is shown that the probable chronological sequence of the five major commentators would run thus: Devabodha—> Vimalabodha—> Satvajña-Nārāyaṇa—> Arjunamiśra—> Nīlakaṇṭha; and the importance of Devabodha's earliest known commentary from the text-critical point of view is also emphasised. The sixth Study, entitled *The Bhṛgus and the Bharata: a Text-historical Study*, is a very important and suggestive paper, in which Sukthankar passes from the necessarily limited sphere of Text-Criticism to the unbounded region of Higher Criticism; but here also he does not abandon his scientific method and attitude, nor does he indulge in unauthenticated hypothesis or sweeping generalisation. The modest object of the paper is apparently to collect in one context the scattered Bhārgava references in the Epic, but in reality the paper goes beyond this in suggesting that the large and ubiquitous Bhārgava element in the present text of the Epic makes it highly probable that it was moulded into its present form under very strong and direct Bhārgava influence. This indication opens up a new avenue of research into the difficult question of

the growth and development of the Epic. The seventh Study gives the collations of the Ādi-parvan text from an old Nepali MS, which is undated but the script, content and appearance of which authenticate its high antiquity. Its great value lies in its corroboration of the constituted text of the Critical Edition and in its independent attestation, in this way, of the fundamental principles of text-reconstruction adopted by Sukthankar. The eighth and last Study, entitled *The Rāma Episode* (*Rāmopākhyāna*) *and the Rāmāyaṇa,* confirms Jacobi's assumption that the Rāmopākhyāna in the Mahābhārata is an epitome of Vālmīki's Rāmāyaṇa itself: a conclusion which is also corroborated by another paper of Sukthankar's (*The Nala Episode and the Rāmāyaṇa*), in which he demonstrates that the Sudeva soliloquy in the Nalopākhyāna of the Mahābhārata, which is a misfit in the present context, must have been adapted from the Rāmāyaṇa.

The two papers included in the series of Epic Questions are no less important and interesting. The first paper discusses the authenticity of the reading *hāsya-rūpeṇa śaṃkaraḥ* adopted in the Critical Edition (Mbh. 1. 57. 21) against the Vulgate reading *haṃsa-rūpeṇa ceśvaraḥ,* and shows that the alleged Haṃsa-incarnation of Indra is nothing but a canard. The second paper, which is unfortunately the last paper published by Sukthankar, deals once again with the question of the Parva-saṃgraha figures, and shows how an exaggerated reliance on them would lead to misleading results and curious conclusions.

The Sukthankar Memorial Number published by the Deccan College Research Institute, with which Sukthankar was connected in many ways, is a substantial and worthy tribute to his memory, planned with enthusiasm, completed within less than a year and published on the first anniversary of his death. The Institute can legitimately claim that it is the first of its kind to pay such a handsome tribute; and it is in the fitness of things that all the contributions are connected with Mahābhārata studies, and are inspired mostly by the work of that illustrious Pathikṛt of Mahābhārata studies, to whose memory the volume is dedicated.

The volume opens with a fairly exhaustive account and estimate of Sukthankar's life and work, covering fifty pages, from the able and enthusiastic pen of the worthy Director, S. M. Katre. This is followed by F. Edgerton's notes on the grammatical and lexical pecularities of the text of Sabhā-parvan, which he has edited for the Bhandarkar Institute. E. D. Kulkarni follows up his researches in Epic grammatical forms by contri-

buting a careful paper on Un-Pāṇinian Forms and Usages in Ādi, Āraṇyaka, Virāṭa and Udyoga. P. K. Narayan Pillai gives a descriptive list of 30 Mahābhārata MSS. in the Travancore University Collection. Moreshwar Dikshit contributes some palæographic notes on an ancient Palm-leaf MSS. of Jayatīrtha's Prameya-dīpikā on the well known Gītā-bhāṣya of Madhva Ānadatīrtha, whose pupil the author Jayatīrtha was. The fairly long paper on Kinship Terms and Family Organisation in the Mahābhārata by Iravati Karve will read with great interest as an excellent critical survey. H. D. Sankalia deals with iconographical elements in the Ādi-parvan, while V. M. Apte traces the Ṛgvedic antecedents of the Dharma-pāśa of Varuṇa mentioned in the Mahābhārata. Irach J. S. Taraporewala makes a comparative study of the Gāthās of Zarathustra and the Bhagavad-gītā; T. S. Shejwalkar examines the Mahābhārata data for Aryan expansion in India; V. M. Apte and D. V. Garge investigate the Mahābhārata citations in the Śabara-bhāṣya; and C. R. Sankaran and K. Rama Varma Raja discuss the sources of Villiputturar-Bhāratam, a Tamil epitome of the Epic made in the latter part of the 14th century. The last two papers give very interesting accounts, by Shaikh Chand Husain and M. A. Chaghtai respectively, of Arabic and Persian translations of the Epic and of the illustrated edition of the Razm Nama, a Persian version of the Epic made at Akbar's Court.

A bare enumeration of the articles, which is all that we can do here with the space at our disposal, will hardly do justice to the spirit of earnest research which animates them; but it will indicate how studies of varied interest and importance can arise out of the Critical Edition of that veritable encyclopædia of Indian literature, religion, philosophy, mythology and culture, which has moulded Indian life and thought through many centuries. The success of this co-operative and co-ordinated project of research carried out mainly by the Staff of the Deccan College Research Institute augurs well for the future of the newly started institution, and reflects great credit on the scholarship and zeal as much of its members as of its able and energetic Director. The volume is the highest possible homage—*námo bháranta émasi dhiyá vayám*—that any Institute can offer to the memory of the great scholar who had always its welfare at heart.

S. K. De

THE PHILOSOPHY OF AESTHETIC PLEASURE. By P. Pañcāpageśa Śāstrī, Vyākaraṇa Sāhitya and Vedāntaśiromaṇi. M.O.L., of the Saṃskṛt Department of the Annamalai Univversity. Annamalai University Sanskrit Series No. 6. Pages, Demy Octavo, xxiv + 324. Price: Rs. 3/-. Annamalai University, Annamalainagar.

The work seeks to elucidate the theory of *Rasa*, as expounded by Bharata in his *Nāṭyaśāstra* and elaborated by Bhaṭṭalollaṭa, Śrīsaṅkuka, Bhaṭṭanāyaka, Abhinavagupta and Jagannātha Paṇḍitarāja. In this connection a thorough analysis is undertaken of the merits and demerits of the different theories (e.g., Generation Theory, Inference Theory, Enjoyment Theory and Suggestion Theory) in the light of criticism found in various works on Poetics. An attempt is made towards the end to vindicate the position of Abhinavagupta. The works of Bhaṭṭalollaṭa, Śrīsaṅkuka and Bhaṭṭanāyaka are not available and their views are dealt with on the basis of references made to them by Abhinavagupta and others. The concluding chapter discusses the theories which count *śānta* and *bhakti* as *rasas* and refers to the different views which consider one or other of the *rasas* as the most prominent.

Numerous extracts are quoted from poetical works and works on poetics, the absence of descriptive accounts of at least some of which will be felt by non-specialists and especially by non-Sanskritists who will also be at a disadvantage to go through sections strewn with Sanskrit extracts and expressions left untranslated.

The work is a welcome addition to the growing literature in English which gives exposition of different aspects of Sanskrit Poetics. Its chief merit lies in its attempt to reconstruct the views of a number of little-known writers on Sanskrit Poetics from incidental scattered references to them as found in various later works and to present them in an English garb but in their original form. Of course this is not an easy task, for the readings in some of the works are apparently corrupt (as the learned author has himself admitted) and the latter might not always give correct representations of the views. But still we must congratulate Mr. Śāstrī on his laudable attempt which goes a great way in giving at least a partial idea of the contributions made to the art of literary criticism by some of our old thinkers.

Mention has been made of the *Bhagavadbhaktisudhārṇava* of Rupagosvāmin (p. 289). This appears to be a slip for *Bhaktirasāmṛtasindhu*.

CHINTAHARAN CHAKRAVARTI

ŚRĪ-VENKAṬEŚA-KĀVYAKALPA edited by D. T. Tatacharya, Siromoni, M.O.L., Tirupati, 1943.

The present work, the first volume of the Venkatesvara Oriental Series, is a collection of short Sanskrit poems glorifying the deity of the same name and his consort. Surely, the devotees of the god will be delighted to have these in a very neatly printed volume. One of the poems (*Śrīnivāsa-guṇâkara*) has along with it a commentary which contains minor informations about the deity. They are useful for the history of religious sects of South India.

M. GHOSH

USĀNIRUDDHAM (*a Prakrit poem in four cantos*) of Rāma-Pāṇivāda, edited by S. S. Sastri and C. Kunhan Raja, Adyar Library 1943.

This work already published by Dr. A. N. Upadhye in 1941 (Journal of the Bombay University, has been edited again with the help of some fresh ms. material for the Adyar Library Series. Besides making some textual improvements the present editors discuss in detail the alleged identity of the author Rāma-Pāṇivāda with Kuñcan Nambiyar, the writer of some Malayalam works. Dr. Kunhan Raja one of the editors of the work has given in this matter an opinion different from that of Dr. Upadhye who touched this subject in the introduction of *Kaṃsavaho*, another Pkt. poem by Rāma-Pāṇivāda, who was a very late Pkt. writer of the eighteenth century (1707-1775), and as such his works should be considered very artificial. Still poems such as the *Kaṃsavaho* or the *Usâniruddha* will be admired as *curios*—products of skill in learning an obsolete language and composing verses in it. By publishing the present text in such a neat manner with indexes of first lines as well as of all words (with meanings) the Adyar Library has earned thanks of all lovers of Pkt. But it cannot be said that this edition has been quite faultless. We regret to say that the editors have not always been very careful in the reconstruction of the text. *Ghoppamāṇā* (I. 17) is evidently a mis-reading for *gheppamāṇā* (=*gṛhṇati*). The retention of all *ḷ's* for *l* has not been very judicious. The evidently South Indian practice of having only *ḷ's* is not sanctioned by Vararuci whom Rāma-Pāṇivāda in all likelihood meant to follow. Dr. Upadhye in his very excellent edition of the *Kaṃsavaho* has given *ḷ's* their proper place (see Introduction p. xi). There is no reason why his decision in this matter should not be accepted.

M. GHOSH

DESCRIPTIVE CATALOGUE OF SANSKRIT MANUSCRIPTS in the Adyar Library, vol. I. Vedic. compiled by K. M. Krishna Sarma, M.O.L. Adyar Library, 1942.

The volume under review being the work no. 35 in the Adyar Library Series gives us much useful information about the rich collection of Vedic manuscripts in the possession of the Theosophical Society, Adyar. Vedic mss. described in this volume have been classified as follows: I. Ṛgveda. II. Yajurveda. III. Sāmaveda. IV. Atharva-veda. V. Miscellaneous. VI. Vedāṅga. Of these, the Miscellaneous section contains mss. giving select *sūktas* with or without comments and the section on the Vedāṅga includes besides Vedāṅga proper its accessory literature.

From a cursory examination of the entries in the volume it appears that the author has done his work diligently though at times he has withheld useful informations. For example, in describing mss. nos. 990-995 (*Vedâṅgāṇi*) he has several times mentioned "the Śikṣā" as one of the Vedâṅgas but has not identified it. It seems that the Śikṣā ascribed to Pāṇini forms a part of these Vedâṅga collections. In spite of this kind of shortcoming this catalogue will be considered useful. Introduction to this catalogue written by Dr. K. Raja contains among other things valuable discussion about the date of Skandasvāmin the celebrated commentator of Yāska's work.

M. Ghosh

TILOYA-PANNATTI OF YATIVṚSABHĀCĀRYA. Pt. I. edited by Profs. A. N. Upadhye and H. Jain with a Hindi paraphrase by Pt. Balachandra. Sholapur, 1943.

The present work, the first volume of the Jivaraja Jain Granthamala, is a Pkt. text dealing principally with Jain cosmography. The author incidentally introduces discussions on Jain dogmatics which are necessary for the understanding of the subject.

Prepared from only two extremely corrupt mss. the edition does not seem to have quite satisfied the two editors even. They may nevertheless give important help for the study of medieval Jainism. This work from the language preserved in the two mss. does not seem to be of great antiquity. Though the two learned editors consider it to be a very old work it does not appear to be much older than the seventh or eighth century. We may hope

that in the second part of the work still to be published the editors will discuss its date. We are thankful to them for editing and publishing this text which was hitherto so little known to scholars.

M. GHOSH

A HISTORY OF GINGEE AND ITS RULERS, by Rao Bahadur C. S. Srinivasachari, M.A., Professor, Annamalai University, Annamalainagar, 1943.

The celebrated fortress of Gingee occupies a very important place in South Indian History. Its history certainly deserves to be written, and no one is more competent to write it than Prof. Srinivasachari. He has utilised all available sources—inscriptions, published and unpublished English, French, Portuguese and Dutch records, Persian and Marathi chronicles, Tamil and Telegu literature—and given us a complete history of Gingee from its foundation to its capture by the British on April 5, 1761. The first two chapters describe the fortifications at Gingee and reconstruct the history of their origin. The third and fourth chapters deal with the rule of the Nāyaks at Gingee and throw new light on the vicissitudes through which the empire of Vijayanagar passed in its later days. To a North Indian reader not quite familiar with the obscure details of medieval South Indian History, these two chapters will probably appear to be the most interesting portion of the book. Chapters V-VI deal with the conquest of Gingee by Bijapur and by Shivaji. Chapter VII deals with the capture of Gingee by the Mughals towards the close of Aurangzib's reign. The subject-matter of these three chapters is generally well-known to all serious students of Indian history and there is very little to add to Sir Jadunath Sarkar's account, but Prof. Srinivasachari has narrated the story with a charming freshness of outlook. Chapters VIII, IX relate to the history of Bundela rule at Gingee. The last chapter deals with the tangled story of the Nawabs of Arcot and the European powers. The book contains a good bibliography, a useful map and some excellent illustrations.

A C. BANERJEE

Select Contents of Oriental Journals

Adyar Library Bulletin (Brahmavidyā), vol. VIII, pt. II

K. MADHAVA KRISHNA SARMA.—*Two Svarodaya Works.* Svarodaya or Śakunaśāstra deals with prognostications of future events especially in warfare. The regulated breathings through the nose, stellar combinations, peculiar arrangements of the alphabet in mystic circles, and similar other means are the bases of divination in this branch of Astrology. Manuscripts of the *Bhūpālavallabha* and the *Paraśurāmopadeśa,* two rare works on the subject, both by Paraśurāma, have been described in the paper.

A. N. KRISHNA AIYANGAR.—*Inscriptions of Uttaramerūr.* Of the two Tamil inscriptions published here, the first belongs to the reign of Kulottuṅgacola and records the sale of lands to the temple of Rajendracolaviṇṇakar ālvar. The second inscription belongs to the time of Rājendra Parakesarivarman of the Cola line. While recording the apportionment of the shares of lands to four Vaikhānasa Bhaṭṭas, this inscription speaks of the various exploits of Rājendra.

–*The Tiruvaḍi of Rājanātha.* Rājanātha's *Acyutarāyābhyudaya* contains an account of Acyutarāya's campaigns in the south and describes how the general of this emperor of Vijayanagara defeated the ruler of Tiruvaḍi. The writer of the paper identifies the ruler of Tiruvaḍi with the king of Travancore.

THE FOLLOWING SERIAL PUBLICATIONS APPEAR IN THIS ISSUE:

ऋग्वेदव्याख्या माधवकृता· Edited.

जीवानन्दनम् (drama) of Ānandarāya Makhin

आश्वलायनगृह्यसूत्रम् with commentaries of Devasvāmin and Nārāyaṇa with Introduction in English completed in this issue.

स्फोटवादः of Nāgeśabhaṭṭa. Edited.

Vaiṣṇavopaniṣads. The English translation of a portion of the *Tripādvibhūtimahānāryaṇopaniṣad* is published in this instalment.

वराहमिहिरहोराशास्त्रम्. Edited with commentary.

आर्यप्रतीत्यसमुतपादनाममहायानसूत्रम्· Reconstructed into Sanskrit from the Tibetan version.

Bharatiya Vidya, vol. IV, pt. II (May, 1943)

K. M. MUNSHI.—*Early Home of Aryans* Arguments are put forward to show that the theory of a European origin of Aryans based on philological reasons are not conclusive.

S. K. DE.—*The Allegorical Drama in Sanskrit.*

A. D. PUSALKAR.—*Indus Civilization: Ceramics, Seals and Sealings, Shell, Ivory, Faince, etc.*

P. K. GODE.—*Date of Yogaratnākara, an anonymous Medical Compendium—between A.D. 1650 and 1725.*

STERNBACH LUDWIK.—*Veśyā; Synonyms and Aphorisms.*

MARYLA FALK.—*The Serpent and the Birds.* This is "a study of the... *motif* connecting, as far back as the oldest strata of the Ṛgveda, the mythical figurations of the cosmic serpent with those of the cosmic Bird."

Indian Culture, vol. IX, no. 4 (April-June, 1943)

V. R. RAMACHANDRA DIKSHITAR.—*A History of Christianity in South India.*

ATINDRA NATH BOSE.—*Hīnasippas.* The condition of men of low occupation such as the basket-maker, leather-worker, potter, weaver, acrobat, magician, dancer, snake-charmer and snake-doctor, is discussed on the basis of statements found in Pāli literature.

J. B. CHAUDHURI.—*Lakṣmaṇa Bhaṭṭa.* Lakṣmaṇa Bhaṭṭa, author of the *Padyaracanā* as distinct from an earlier poet of the same name, has been assigned to the 17th century. The verses composed by Lakṣmaṇa contained in his *Padyaracanā,* or quoted in works of anthology have been classified in the paper according to the subject-matter. The merits of these poems are discussed and the probable identity of the poet with an author of some other works is pointed out.

SAKUNTALA RAO SASTRI.—*Caṇḍasena of Kaumudīmahotsava.* The writer of the note is not inclined to accept the view that Candragupta I, the founder of the Gupta dynasty, is identical with the Caṇḍasena of the drama *Kaumudīmohatsava,* because of the fact that Caṇḍasena is described in the drama as being adopted son of Sundaravarman coming from a family of low origin.

Journal of Andhra History and Culture, vol. I, no. 1

M. RAMA RAO.—*The Ānanda Gotra Kings.* The Cenzerala stone inscription, the Maṭṭepāḍu plates of Dāmodaravarman, and the Gōraṇṭla Plates of Attivarman. supply information about a line of kings belonging to Ānanda Gotra. They ruled over a portion of the Guntur District during the early centuries of the Christian era. It is conjectured that they were exterminated by the Viṣṇukuṇḍins about the beginning of the 6th centudy.

G. J. SOMAYAJI.—*The Origin and Development of the Post-positions in Telugu.*

Journal of the Benares Hindu University, vol. VIII, nos. 2-3 (1944)

HARIT KRISHNA DEB.—*Vikramāditya and his Era.* The purpose of the paper is to show that Gautamīputra Sātakarṇi, the Andhra ruler preceding Puloma I in the 1st century B.C., was responsible for the foundation of the Vikrama era.

SUBODH CHANDRA MUKHERJEE.—*The Message of the Gītā.*

S. C. GUHA.—*Indo-Chinese Cordiality through the Ages.*

Journal of the Bihar Research Society, vol. XXX, pt I (March, 1944)

B. BHATTACHARYYA.—*New Light on the History of the Imperial Gupta Dynasty.* Important details about the Imperial Guptas are contained in *Kaliyugarāja-vṛttānta* section of the *Bhaviṣyottarapurāṇa.* Candragupta I, the founder of the Gupta dynasty belonged to a royal family of Śrīparvata somewhere in the Himalayan region near Nepal. He had secured the position of commander-in-chief under the Andhra king Candraśrī of Magadha, but killed his master by some stratagem and usurped his throne afterwards. He is said to have ruled for seven years and established an era in his own name. He was assassinated along with his associates by his own son Samudragupta. All the stanzas furnishing valuable information are published here with comments.

S. A. SHERE.—*"Tuhfat-us-salatin."—A rare manuscript dated A.H. 950 = 1543 A.D.* The manuscript containing selected verses of the poet Amir Shahi and autographs of Jahangir and Shah Jahan with their chronograms has been described, and its origin and history traced.

KALI KINKAR DATTA.—*Cession of the Dutch Possessions in India to the British Government, 1824-25.*

JAGADISH NARAYAN SARKAR.—*Some Aspects of the Qutbshahi Administration of Golkunda.*

Journal of Indian History, vol. XXIII, pt, I (April, 1944)

S. K. BANERJI.—*The Administration Buildings in Fathpur Sikri.* The paper contains a description of buildings connected with the general administration at Fathpur Sikri such as the Diwan-i-am, the Diwan-i-khas the Daftar-khana, the mint, the treasuries, the Shifa-khana (hospital) and the Langar-khana that were constructed by Akbar near the residence of a saint of the place.

SAYYAD HASAN ASKARI.—*Raja Ram Narain and the Post-Plassay Affairs.*

Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal, Letters, vol. IX, no. 2

C. W. GURNER.—*Psychological Imagery in Kalidāsa.*

K. P. CHATTOPADHYAY.—*Kortu Funeral Customs and Memorial Posts.*

CHARU CHANDRA DAS GUPTA.—*Some Terracotas from Mathurā preserved in the Francis Hopp Museum of Asiatic Arts.*

Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland,
1943, pts. III & IV

DORA GORDINE.—*Masterpieces of Oriental Art.* The artistic excellences of 'a Yakṣī under a Tree.' a thirteenth century masterpiece from Konaraka in Orissa is pointed out in this instalment of the continued discussion.

H. BUCHTHAL.—*The Common Classical Sources of Buddhist and Christian Narrative Art.* The aim of the discourse is to prove that 'the parallel development of the cycles depicting the lives of Christ and of the Buddha' was 'based on iconographic formulæ evolved in Roman historical sculpture.'

ALFRED MASTER.—"*The Mysterious Paiśacī.*" The paper collects literary evidence on the nature of the language referred to as *Paiśācī,* in which the lost *Bṛhatkathā* of Guṇāḍhya is known to have been written. The conclusion reached in this instalment of the article is that Paiśācī was the non-Buddhist name for Pāli and a substitute for Prakrit in the South.

Journal of the United Provinces Historical Society.
vol. XVI, pt. I (July, 1943)

VASUDEVA S. AGRAWALA.—*Geographical Data in Pāṇini's Aṣṭādhyāyī.* It has been shown in the paper that much historical and ethnographical

information may be gathered by an analysis of Pāṇini's methods of formation of geographical nomenclature especially in respect of names of countries, janapadas, towns, villages, mountains, forests, and rivers.

A. S. ALTEKAR.—*Yaudheyas as the Political Successors of the Kuṣāṇas in North India.*

VASUDEVA S. AGRAWALA.—*Mathura Āyāgapaṭṭas.* The Āyāgapaṭṭas or stone slabs carved with sacred symbols and figures of Tīrthaṅkaras were worshipped by the early Jain devotees. Such Āyāgapaṭṭas found in the ancient Stūpa at Kankali Tila in Mathura have been described here.

TARA DATT GAIROLS.—*Early History of Garhwal Rajas (634 to 1325 A.D.).*

ADRIS BANERJI.—*Some Mediaeval Temples of Malwa.*

KISHORI SARAN LAL.—*A Note on Alauddin's Expedition to Warangal (1302-3 A.D.).*

SAIYID NURUL HASAN.—*The 'Mahzar' of Akbar's Reign.* The 'Mahzar' is a document issued in Akbar's reign asserting his authority in religious matters. The significance of its issue is discussed.

S. K. BANERJI.—*The Monuments of Aurangzib's Reign.*

RADHA KAMAL MUKHERJI.—*The Economic History of India.*

Philosophical Quarterly, vol. XIX, no. 2, (July, 1943)

M. D. GADGIL.—*Is Bhagavān Śaṅkara the Author of the Bhāṣyam on the Īśa Upaniṣad going under his Name?* As some of the views embodied in the *Īśopaniṣad-bhāṣya* ascribed to Śaṅkarācārya are not in strict consonance with the views expressed in his other writings, the former work could not have been written by the Ācārya.

Obituary Notices

Prof. Carlo Formichi
(1871-1943)

With the passing away of Prof. Carlo Formichi of Italy, India has lost a sincere friend and a profound student of her ancient culture. His loss will be deeply mourned by every Indian as well as by his countrymen. F. Kielhorn was his teacher of Sanskrit and H. Oldenberg was his fellow-student. When Rabindranath Tagore met him in Italy in the beginning of 1925. Formichi was then occupying the chair of Sanskrit in the University of Rome and had already made reputation as an Indologist. Before this he published an Italian translation of the *Kāmandakīya Nītisāra* (*Giornale della Società Asiatica, Italiana,* vols. 12-17, 1896-1904), a life of Aśvaghoṣa together with an Italian translation of the *Buddhacarita* (*Açvaghoṣa, poeta del Buddhismo,* Bari, 1912). This second work was a valuable contribution to the critical restoration of the text of the great epic of Aśvaghoṣa and its explanation. Besides this he published a comparative study of Macchiavelli and Kauṭilya about the year 1915. Before he started for India on the invitation of Tagore his great work on Indian religious thought was in the press and was published soon after (*Il pensiero nell' India prima del Buddha,* Bologna, 1925). As its name implies Formichi in this work gave an interpretation of the religious thought of India as revealed in pre-Buddhistic works. His very illuminating examination of certain aspects of our ancient literature and a very able survey of the entire field won the admiration of scholars outside Italy, and a French translation of the work with the author's preface was published not much later (*La pense religieuse de l'Ind avanti Buddha,* Paris, 1930).

As the fourth visiting professor of the Visvabharati, Formichi, besides taking classes in *Kāmandakīya Nītisāra* and the *Buddhacarita,* delivered a course of general lectures on 'the Dynamic Element in Indian Religious Development' (published in the *Visvabharati Quarterly,* 1926-27). He also delivered two lectures at the invitation of the Universities of Calcutta and Dacca. The subject on which he lectured in Calcutta was "Upaniṣads as Landmarks in the History of India" (published in the *Journal of the Department of Letters,* C.U. 1927) and his Dacca lecture was on "Meditative

and Active India" (published Dacca, 1926). The three lectures which he delivered before the cultured audience in Santiniketan, Calcutta and Dacca were characterized by sound critical scholarship coupled with a singular freedom from racial bias. In all these lectures he was never tired of putting emphasis on the fact that India in spite of her later degenerate condition was never always so during her long past history. To put Formichi's thesis briefly, India in the past was not only meditative but very active as well. His classes in Kāmandaka and Aśvaghoṣa in the Visvabharati were full of many attractions. Besides his great scholarship his genial personality as well as power of creating interest in the subject taught were the most notable among them. Formichi was a great lover of Sanskrit *Belles-lettres* especially its epigramatic *subhāṣitas*. Among Sanskritists of modern Italy he has left some able students and the very well-known Prof. Giuseppe Tucci is one of them.

MANOMOHAN GHOSH

Prof. Heinrich Lüders
(1869-1943)

With the Prof. H. Lüder's death which has occurred recently, passes away one of the great German scholars in Indology. There is scarcely any important branch of this science which he has not enriched by his valuable contributions. His studies in Vedic phonetics, Mahābhārata, Purāṇas, Pāli-Jātaka, ancient drama and epigraphy are well-known. The great quality of varied writings which he produced during nearly half a century speak very eloquently about his rare critical acumen as well as astonishing power of patient enquiry. He began his career as a Sanskritist with the study of Vedic phonetics. (*Die Vyāsaçiksā in ihren Verhaltniss zum Taittirīya Prātiçākhya*, Kiel, 1895). But very wisely he left the crowded field of the Vedic scholarship to which the study of the *Vyāsaśikṣā* might have naturally led him, for the comparatively less attended to departments of Indic studies such as Epics, Purāṇas, Pāli Jātakas etc.

In his paper named "*Die Sage von Ṛsyaśṛnga* (Proceedings of the Royal Society of Science, Göttingen, 1897) he proved that the Ṛsyaśṛnga legend has an older form in the *Padma-purāṇa* than in our *Mahābhārata*. In this paper Jātaka version of the legend was also discussed and it was shown convincingly that not only in the original form of the story as it has come

down to us in the Pāli Jātaka but also in the earlier form of the *Mahābhārata* itself, the princess Śāntā was the seducer of the *muni*. The enquiry related to the paper, naturally led him to the very complicated but interesting problem of a critical text of the Mahābhārata. Soon after this was published his memorable contribution on the Southern version of the great epic (*Über die Grantha-recension des Mahābhārata*, 1901). Indians will have to remain specially grateful to Lüders for the thorough mastery which he attained afterwards in the method of handling the Mahābhārata text, for it was considerably due to the excellent training which he could give on the subject to the late Dr. Sukthankar that the latter could bring out the first critical edition of the great epic of India. The worth and magnitude of this work undertaken by the Bhandarkar Institute Poona is too well-known to need elaborate mention here.

Even if Lüders was giving much attention to the *Mahābhārata* he did not leave aside the work he already began in Indian epigraphy (*A List of Brahmi Inscriptions*, Ep. Indica, vol. X, Appendix). His work on the literary finds from the Eastern Turkistan was a proof of this (*Über die literarische Funde von Ostturkistan*, 1914). These finds were important for at least two reasons. From these, Lüders discovered the fragments of three Indian plays one of which was by Aśvaghoṣa. Study of these fragments threw unexpected light on the early history of Indian drama as well as of the Skt. and Pkt. languages (*Brückstücke buddhistischer Dramen*, Berlin, 1911). The next point of importance in these finds of the Eastern Turkistan was the recovery of fragments of Kumāralāta's *Kalpanāmaṇḍitikā* (circa 300 A.C.). This valuable work written in Skt. was already lost except in a Chinese version.

Besides producing major works mentioned above Lüders succeeded F. Kielhorn as an editor of the famous Encyclopaedia of Indo-Aryan Researches (*Grundriss der Indo-Arishen Philologie und Altertumskunde*, begun in 1897), and occupied the chair of Sanskrit in the University of Berlin during the latter part of his career. During 1927-28 Lüders came to India and paid visit to learned institutions like the Visvabharati, Santiniketan and the Bhandarkar Inst. Poona.

He had many brilliant students among whom were the late Zimmer and the late Sukthankar.

MANOMOHAN GHOSH

Printed and published by J. C. Sarkhel at the Calcutta Oriental Press, Ltd., 9, Panchanan Ghosh Lane, Calcutta.

CONTENTS

PAGE

The Date of Vidyāpati 211
By Dr. Md. Shahidullah, M.A., D.LITT.

The Doctrine of Doṣas in Sanskrit Poetics 217
By K. Krishna Moorty, M.A.

Tirlingi Inscription of Devendravarman, son of Guṇārṇava: (Gaṅga) Year 192 232
By R. K. Ghoshal, M.A.

Kālibhanā Copper-plate Inscriptions of the Somavaṃśī King Mahā-Bhavagupta I Janamejaya 237
By Dr. D. C. Sircar, M.A., PH.D. & P. C. Rath

Some NIA Words from Apabhraṃśa 251
By Prof. Kalipada Mitra, M.A.

Some Aspects of the Worship of Nārāyaṇa 275
By Nanimadhab Chaudhuri, M.A.

Miscellany:

Ubalike, Umbali, Unbali 285
By Prof. K. A. Nilakanta Sastri, M.A.

A Note on Pādānudhyāta 288
By Prof. V. V. Mirashi, M.A.

Pāli Vedagū 290
By Dr. Baburam Saksena, M.A., D.LITT.

Reviews:

The Early Aryans in Gujarata 293
By Prof. Anil Chandra Banerji, M.A.

The Beginnings of Indian Historiography and other Essays ... 293
By Dr. P. C. Bagchi, M.A., D.LITT.

Jñāna-Dīpikā 295
By Dr. Manomohan Ghosh, M.A., PH.D.

Important Inscriptions from the Baroda State 296
By Dr. D. C. Sircar, M.A., PH.D.

Select Contents of Oriental Journals: 298